



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Per. 971 e. $\frac{126}{8}$



THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.



Πύλαι ἄδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.—*Matt. xvi. 18.*

VOL. VIII.



LONDON :

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, 342, STRAND.

VINCENT, OXFORD ; DEIGHTON, AND STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE ; MILLIKEN,
DUBLIN ; GRANT, AND LAING AND FORBES, EDINBURGH.

AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXL.

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE.
I. THE OFFICE OF A BISHOP.		
	A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation, in October, 1838. By Charles James, Lord Bishop of London.	
	2. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, at the Triennial Visitation, in 1838. By John Bird Sumner, Lord Bishop of Chester.	
	3. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, in 1838. By John Kaye, Lord Bishop of Lincoln.	
	4. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury, at the Primary Visitation. By Edward, Lord Bishop of Salisbury	1
II. NATIONAL EDUCATION.		
	Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England	27
III. CANON AND STATUTE SIMONY.		
	A Practical Arrangement of Ecclesiastical Law. By Francis N. Rogers, Barrister-at-Law, Q.C.	
	2. Bacon's Abridgement of the Law—Title Simony. Seventh edition. By Sir H. Gwillim and Charles H. Dodd.	
	3. Codex Juris Ecclesiasti Anglicani. By Edmund Gibson, D.D. 2 vols. folio.	52
IV. LORD BROUGHAM'S DEMOSTHENES.		
	Demosthenes upon the Crown. Translated, with Notes. By Henry Lord Brougham.	67
V. BOURDALOUE—BARROW—MASSILLON.		
	Bourdaloue P. Sermons pour tous les jours de Carême. 2 toms.	
	2. Works of Isnac Barrow, D.D. Edited by the Rev. J. Hughes. 7 vols.	
	3. Massillon, Eveque de Clermont, Œuvres. 2 tom.	86
VI. SPIRITUAL DESTITUTION—NEW SOUTH WALES.		
	The State of Religion and Education in New South Wales. By William Westbrooke Burton, Esq., one of the Judges of the Supreme Court in the Colony.	111
VII. STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE JEWS.		
	Jerusalem and the Jewish Cause : a Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, respecting the State and Prospects of the Jews and the Jewish Mission in Syria. By the Rev. W. B. Hurnard, M.A.	
	2. Israel's Return ; or Palestine Regained. By Joseph Elisha Freeman.	
	3. Sketches of Judaism and the Jews. By the Rev. Dr. McCaul.	129

ART.	PAGE.
VIII. DOCUMENTARY ANNALS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, being a Collection of Injunctions, Declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, &c., from the year 1546 to the year 1716, with Notes, historical and explanatory. By Edward Cardwell, D.D., Principal of St. Alban's Hall.	141
IX. THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE SCOTTISH KIRK. An Apology for the Church of Scotland. By the Rev. John Cumming, M.A. 2. Knox's Book of Common Order, with a Preface, &c. By the Rev. John Cumming, M.A.	170
X. NAVAL AND MILITARY CHAPLAINS. The Hope of the Navy; or the True Source of Discipline and Efficiency, as set forth in the Articles of War. By Rear-Admiral Sir Jahleel Brenton, Bart., K.C.B., Lieut.- Governor of Greenwich Hospital. 2. An Appeal to the British Nation in behalf of our Sailors. By the same. 3. Extracts from Holy Writ, and various Authors; intended as Helps to Meditation and Prayer, principally intended for Soldiers and Seamen. By Captain Sir Nesbit J. Wil- loughby, R.N., C.B., K.C.H. 4. A Reverie of a Retired Officer on the Naval and Military Bible Society; addressed to Red Coats and Blue Jackets. 180	180
XI. MEMOIR OF BISHOP BURGESS. The Life of Thomas Burgess, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., &c., &c., &c., late Lord Bishop of Salisbury. By John L. Harford, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S. London: Longman.	197

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Clergy Reserves: The Christian Knowledge Society: Church Rates: Proprietary Chapels: The Inspection of National Schools: Societies: Socialism: Subscription to the Thirty- Nine Articles, and Proposals for Altering the Liturgy: The Episcopal Clergy of Scotland and America: Church Extension	209
---	-----

GENERAL LITERATURE.

A History of England upon Christian Principles	230
The History of France, from the earliest periods to the present time	281
The History of Spain and Portugal. By Miss Julia Corner	231
Help to the Reading of the Bible. By Benjamin Elliott Nicholls, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Walthamstow	232
Dodd's Church History of England. By the Rev. M. A. Tierney, F.S.A.	232

	PAGES
Roman Misquotation. By the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope, A.M.	232
A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English. By Samuel Lee, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, in the University of Cambridge	233
The Standard of Catholicity. By the Rev. G. E. Biber, L.L.D.	233
Sermons on the Sacraments. By Henry Bullinger	233
Lectures on Locke; or the Principles of Logic	233
L'Eglise Romaine comparé avec la Bible, les Pères l'Eglise et l'Eglise Anglicane, en Six Sermons prêchés par l'Evêque Luscombe	234
Groans of the Grocers—Moans of the Slaves; or, An Address to the Society for the Civilization of Africa	235
The Works of Josephus. Translated by W. Whiston, A.M.	235
The History of Popish Transubstantiation. By John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. A new edition, revised, with the authorities printed at full length; to which is added a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. J. S. Brewer, M.A.	236
Parliamentary Speeches	237
The Book of Illustrations. By the Rev. H. G. Salter, A.M.	237
Travels in the Holy Land. By M. De Geramb	237
A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities	238
A Manual of Diseases of the Eye. By S. Littell, M.D.	238
The Life and Times of Martin Luther	248
Sonnets written strictly in the Italian style	238
Plain Sermons preached to Country Congregations	239
Sermons preached in St. Paul's Chapel, Stonehouse, &c. &c.	239
Sermons on Practical Subjects, chiefly preached in the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin	239
Continental Sermons; or, Nine Discourses addressed to Congregations on the Continent	239
Biblical Topography: Lectures on the Position and Character of the Places mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, with maps	239
The Domestic Altar; or Prayers for the use of Families for one Month	239
The History of England, from the Accession to the Decease of King George the Third. By John Adolphus, Esq.	240
The History of the University of Cambridge, from the Conquest to the year 1634	240
Triplicity	240
An Apology for Cathedral Service	240
Pere la Chaise; or the Confessor. A Tale of the Times	241
Messiah the Prince; or the Mediatorial Dominion of Jesus Christ	241
Views of the Architecture of the Heavens, in a series of Letters to a Lady. By J. P. Nichol, L.L.D., F.R.S., &c.	242
Christ and Anti-Christ; a Poem in Seven Cantos	242
Cardinal Bellarmine's Notes of the Church, examined and confuted	242
Thoughts on the Litany	243
An Examination of the Ancient Orthography of the Jews; and of the original state of the Text of the Hebrew Bible	243
Hymns in Prose for Children. By Mrs. Barbauld	244

	PAGES
The Early English Church. By Edward Churton, M.A.	246
Tales of the Village. By Francis E. Paget, M.A.	246
Translation of Griesbach's New Testament	246
A Refutation of the First Report of the Constabulary Force Com- missioners. By the Rev. C. D. Brereton, A.M.	247
Tracts on the Church and the Prayer Book	247
Tracts of the Anglican Fathers. Nos. 11, 12, 13.	247
The Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk	247
Outlines of China. By Robert Bell, Esq.	248
A Life of Socrates. By Dr. G. Wiggins	248
A Treatise on the Pastoral Care	248
Memoir of the Rev. Henry Mowes	249
The Prelate	249
Sorrow and Consolation ; or, the Gospel preached under the Cross	249
Party Politics and Political Prospects	250
Ingliston ; a Tale. By Grace Webster	250
The Psalter or Psalms of David	250
Nautical Sketches. By Hamilton Moore, Jun.	251
The Alphabet explained : or the Science of Articulate Sounds	251
The Universal Tendency to Association in Mankind Analyzed and Illustrated	251
On the Nobility of the British Gentry ; or, the Political Ranks and Dignities of the British Empire	252
Jephthah ; or the Maid of Gilead	252
Aid to Devotion	253
Christian Consolations taught from Five Heads in Religion	253
Pictures of Religion and Religious Truth	253
On the Principles of Common or Inaptive Discipline	253
Transubstantiation and the Romish Sacrifice of the Mass	253
Popery ; Practical, Past, Present, and Prospective	253
The Anglo-Catholic Use of Two Lights upon the Altar	253
Essay on the Utility, Origin, and Progress of Writing	253
The Dignity and Claims of the Christian Poor	253
Tracts on Christian Doctrine and Practice	253
The City of God. By John Fuller Russell, B.C.L.	253
The Observance of Lent. By James Skinner, B.A.	253
Come out of Rome. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth, M.A.	253
The Church and the Chapters	253
Narratives and Tracts. Nos. 1 to 6.	253
A Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration	254
Letter to Thomas Phillips, Esq., R.A.	254
A Speech read at the Monthly General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge	254

FINE ARTS.

Melancthon's First Misgivings of the Church of Rome	254
Napier Sturt, youngest son of H. C. Sturt, Esq., M.P.	256
A Pictorial Plan of the University and City of Oxford	256
Illustrations of the Works of Mercy. Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4	256
Canadian Scenery. Parts 4 and 5.	256

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE.
I. DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH.	
Lectures on the Church of England, delivered in London, March, 1840. By the Rev. Hugh McNeile, M.A., Minister of St. Jude's Church, Liverpool.	
2. The Standard of Catholicity ; or an Attempt to point out, in a plain manner, certain safe and leading Principles amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated. By the Rev. G. E. Biber, L.L.D.	
3. The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches vindicated against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman, in the "Dublin Review." By the Rev. William Palmer, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford.	
4. The Church and Dissent ; an Appeal to Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Sects, on the Constitution of the Church of England, and the Character and Unreasonableness of Schism and Dissent. By the Rev. Charles Burton, LL.D., F.L.S.	257
II. ARISTOPHANES AND HIS BIRDS.	
Aristophanis opera omnia. F. H. Bothe.	
2. The Birds of Aristophanes. By J. W. Suvern. Translated by W. R. Hamilton, F.R.S.	282
III. THE SILURIAN AND DEVONIAN SYSTEMS.	
The Silurian System, &c. By Roderick Impey Murchison, F.R.S., F.L.S., &c. &c. In two parts.	
2. Report of the Geology of Cornwall, Devon, and West Somerset. By Henry T. De la Beche, F.R.S., &c. Published by Order of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury	299
IV. ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.	
A Glossary of Terms used in Grecian, Roman, Italian, and Gothic Architecture. The third Edition, enlarged, exemplified by seven hundred wood-cuts. 2 vols.	
2. Illustrations of Monumental Brasses.	
3. Ancient Models ; containing some Remarks on Church Building. Addressed to the Laity. By Charles Anderson, Esq.	330

ART.	PAGE.
V. NAVAL AND MILITARY CHAPLAINS.	
The Hope of the Navy ; or the True Source of Discipline and Efficiency, as set forth in the Articles of War. By Rear-Admiral Sir Jahleel Brenton, Bart., K.C.B., Lieut.-Governor of Greenwich Hospital.	
2. Extracts from Holy Writ, and various Authors ; intended as Helps to Meditation and Prayer, principally intended for Soldiers and Seamen. By Captain Sir Nesbit J. Wilmoughby, R.N., C.B., K.C.H.	
3. The Church in the Navy and Army.	
4. A Reverie of a Retired Officer on the Naval and Military Bible Society ; addressed to Red Coats and Blue Jackets.	
5. An Appeal to the British Nation in behalf of our Sailors. By Sir Jahleel Brenton	359
VI. ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.	
2. The Whole Works of the Rev. Joseph Bingham, including Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church, carefully collected ; with the Quotations in the Original Languages at length, instead of merely the References, as formerly given, a new set of Maps of Ecclesiastical History, and Life of the Author. 9 vols.	383
VII. THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN FRANCE.	
Projet d'Ordonnance portant Règlement d' Administration pour les Eglises Reformées.	
2. Lettre d'un Laïque à un Pasteur, sur le Projet d'Ordonnance portant règlement d'Administration pour les Eglises Reformées.	
3. Lettre à un Pasteur sur le Projet d'Ordonnance, &c. Par Athanase Coquerel, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Reformée de Paris.	
4. Lettre à M. Athanase Coquerel, sur le Projet d'Ordonnance, &c. Par le Cte. Agenor de Gasparin, Maître des Requêtes au Conseil d'Etat.	
5. Lettre à M le Cte. A. de Gasparin, sur le Methodisme. Par Joseph Martin Paschoud, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Reformée de Paris.	
6. Le Salut dans toutes les Eglises. Sermon par Athanase Coquerel	404
VIII. PSALMODY.	
The Christian Psalmist. By James Montgomery.	
2. Odes Sacrées ou les Pseaumes de David, en Vers François.	422

ART.

PAGE.

IX. THE PROGRESS OF REVOLUTION.

- The French Revolution : a History. By T. Carlyle.
2. Speeches in Parliament during the Session, 1840.
3. Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill. A Speech in Behalf of Deans and Chapters, made before the Long Parliament. By John Hacket, D.D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's, and afterwards Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. Now reprinted, with Preface and Notes. By a Clergyman 449

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

- Episcopal Appointments : The Episcopal Clergy of Scotland and America : The Church Discipline Bill : The Clergy Reserves : Church-rates and John Thorogood : The Regency Bill : Church Extension : The Dean and Chapter of Exeter : The Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill 470

GENERAL LITERATURE.

- Unitarianism tried by Scripture and Experience. By a Layman 489
- A Numismatic Manual. By John Yonge Ackerman, F.S.A. . 490
- The English Mother. By a Lady 493
- A Hand-book for the Churches. By a Labourer for Peace . 493
- Selections from Robert Hall, A.M. By Charles Badham, B.A. . 494
- The Life of Luther. By T. S. Williams 495
- A Digest of Hooker's Treatise on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. By the Rev. J. B. Smith, D.D. 495
- Propædia Prophetica. By William Rowe Lyall, M.A. . . 496
- Lectures on Ancient Israel. By J. Wilson 496
- History of the Great Reformation in the Sixteenth Century . 497
- The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark Paraphrased . . 497
- Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts . 498
- A Practical Discourse on Religious Assemblies. By W. Sherlock 498
- Moral Contrast : a Tale. By F. Bolingbroke Ribbons, F.S.A. 498
- The Siege of Lichfield. By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A. . . 499
- The Churchman's Brief Manual of Baptism 499
- Universal Redemption Considered 499
- A Letter to the Author of "Universal Redemption Considered" . 499
- The Mineralogy and Botany of the Bible 500
- The Reasons of a Romanist Considered 500
- A Dissertation on the Discourse Delivered by our Blessed Saviour 500
- Religion in connexion with a National System of Instruction . 500
- Parliamentary Speeches. Session 1840. 501
- Practical Piety. By Hannah More 501
- Christian Morals. By the Rev. William Sewell, M.A. . . . 502
- The True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England. By Andrew Sall, D.D. 503
- A Practical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Church Catechism . 503
- Gospel Extracts for Young Children 503

	PAGE.
An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England . . .	504
A Treatise on Justification. By the Rev. George Holden, M.A. . . .	505
Guy Fawkes ; or the Gunpowder Treason, A.D., 1605 . . .	506
The Spanish Armada, A.D. 1588 . . .	506
Oriental Musings ; and other Poems. By P. Scott, Esq. . . .	507
Proper Lessons to be read at Morning and Evening Prayer . . .	507
Letters from Italy to a Younger Sister. By Catherine Taylor . . .	507
Heber ; and other Poems. By Thomas Ragg . . .	508
An Outline of the History of the British Church. By Philecclesia . . .	508
The History of England in Amusing Conversations . . .	508
Six Sermons on the Church and her Ministry . . .	508
God's History of Man. By the Rev. John Edward Sabin, B.A. . . .	508
Olney Lectures. By the Rev. D. B. Langley, D.C.L. . . .	508
Ministerial First Fruits. By the Rev. J. W. Watson, B.A. . . .	508
Sermons. By the late Rev. Thomas Webster, B.D. . . .	509
Sermons on Various Subjects . . .	509
Sermons on Miscellaneous Subjects. By W. J. E. Bennett, M.A. . . .	509
Justification through Faith. By Philip N. Shuttleworth, D.D. . . .	509
Plain Parochial Sermons. By the Rev. James Slade, M.A. . . .	509
The Affairs of this World all Ordered with a Reference to the Church. A Sermon, &c. By Thomas Stone, M.A. . . .	510
The Mercy of God a Call to Repentance. A Sermon, &c. . . .	510
A Sermon on the Preservation of our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, &c. By the Rev. J. C. Ebdon, M.A. . . .	511
The Worship of Imaginations. A Sermon. By Bishop Andrews . . .	511
The Claim of the S. P. G. F. P. upon all Members of the Church . . .	511
A Series of Documents and Authorities on the Duty, Advantage, and Necessity of Public Catechising in the Church . . .	511
A Letter to the Clergy on the Speech of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Norwich, in the House of Lords, May 26, 1840 . . .	511
The Doctrine of Holy Scripture on Religious Celibacy . . .	511
On Intercourse between the Church of England and the Churches in the East. By the Rev. James Beaven, M.A. . . .	511
"If any Provide not for his Own" . . .	511
Observations on a Petition for the Revision of the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland . . .	511
An Enquiry respecting the Destiny of the Ten Tribes . . .	511
A Speech delivered at the Official Dinner of High Sheriff Tom- linson, in the City of Dublin. By Isaac Butt, Esq. . . .	511
Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill: a Speech on Behalf of Deans and Chapters. By John Hackett, D.D. . . .	511
The Case of St. Paul and the Necessity of Appointment to the Ministerial Office. By the Rev. Thomas Farley, B.D. Oxon. . . .	511
Courvoisier. A Sermon Preached at Eton Chapel, London . . .	511
Religion and Crime. By John Minter Morgan . . .	511
A Discourse on Protestantism . . .	512
An Appeal on Behalf of Church Government, &c. . . .	512
The Watchman's Cry. By the Rev. C. Burton, LL.D., F.L.S. . . .	512
A Sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, Bognor . . .	512
The Clergy Watchmen unto the People . . .	512

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

JULY, MDCCCXL.

- ART. I.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation, in October, 1838.* By CHARLES JAMES, LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. London: Fellowes.
2. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester, at the Triennial Visitation, in 1838.* By JOHN BIRD SUMNER, LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER. London: Hatchard.
3. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, in 1838.* By JOHN KAYE, LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN. London: Rivington.
4. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury, at the Primary Visitation.* By EDWARD, LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY. London: Cochran, 1839.

IN casting our eyes over the records of antiquity, and more especially those of the Primitive Church, it is not often that our first general survey enables us to form a correct idea of the subject. We see the lives and actions of great men—we trace the course of great events; and while dazzled by the splendid characters, and absorbed by the interesting circumstances thus brought under our notice, we forget the vast mass of small men, and their daily transactions of petty business. The brilliant lights of the age are brought nearer together, while the desert fields they illuminated are withdrawn from our view. We walk and talk with heroes and princes, with saints and martyrs, and “the people,” though forming an essential part of the picture, are yet thrown altogether in the back-ground—they are hidden by the gorgeous curtain of high reputations; and were it not for the glory reflected on heroes for slaughtering them, on sovereigns for justly ruling them, and on saints for reforming them, they would be scarcely heard of at all. In the page of history they are rather implied than expressed.

VOL. VIII.—B

We have observed that this is peculiarly the case with the ideas we form of the Primitive Church. The sanctity which we attach to the very names of the Fathers, and which, though doubtless carried to a dangerous extent by those who would make the Patristic tomes authorities in matters of faith, as well as witnesses in matters of fact, is yet no lawful subject either for satire or for blame. That due reverence for antiquity which Isaac Taylor, in a book replete with error, yet eloquently defends, becomes magnified in proportion as its objects recede into the past, like a ship seen dimly through a mist. The visible glory of God, revealed in the person of the Saviour, sheds a light over the early ages of Christianity, compared to which all other glory grows pale indeed; and though a further consideration would teach us that the light of that presence has been continued, and we believe increased, even to the present day, by the spiritual guidance vouchsafed to the Church, we yet can with difficulty persuade ourselves that the nearer ages to that surpassing manifestation of divinity were not necessarily holier than our own more remote æra. It is quite true, however, that, in the present day, there are aids given to the student of Ancient Christianity which were till very lately wanting; and there are means of correcting our judgments which, if used cautiously, will be found very efficacious. A little reading will, when properly directed, *now* suffice to give us a correct general notion of the Church, as it was in its earlier period. The writers and followers of the Oxford Tracts have approached the subject with a strong bias on the one side; the author of "Ancient Christianity" and his followers with an equally strong bias on the other. With the former are ranged more than one talented periodical; with the latter several of the small fry of literature. We purpose ourselves to take up the middle ground, which we believe to be the ground occupied by the Catholic Church of England: equally distant from the semi-Popery of the one, and the more than semi-Dissent of the other.

But we have observed, that a correct general notion of the Church during her earlier ages may, in these days, be formed without very extensive reading. Those, even, who are unacquainted with the languages of the Fathers, may yet consult the Tracts for the Times, and other works of the same class, and by the same writers, perfectly sure that the profound learning of those divines will not fail to bring forward, prominently, *all* the advantages, real or fancied, which antiquity possessed over our own æra. He may consult the Osbornes and the Taylors, and those of *their* sentiments, to find out *all* the deformities, all the errors, all the weaknesses, of those who have long since appeared before God. He will find inferior learning, and inferior logic, and inferior

candour; but he will, nevertheless, find much fact which cannot be refuted, much scriptural truth which must not be rejected. The case seems to lie in a small compass; the question is one almost as much of feeling as of principle. The Tractarians (we use the word for convenience, and not in a disrespectful sense) are fully aware that *all* scripture is given by inspiration of God; that he has made no distinction of truth into essential and non-essential, of sin into venial and mortal; and they have carried out this principle into matters of discipline, where it is no longer applicable. The disciples, if not the leaders of this school, have confounded antiquity with apostolicity; have treated rites and ceremonies as though they were matters of vital moment. Forgetting that truth is always more ancient than error, they have evinced a disposition to prefer an error, sanctioned by antiquity, to a truth which could not, in their view, be satisfactorily traced back to the same extent.

Their opponents, on the other hand, have confounded antiquity with Popery—have virtually assumed the principle, that every man is to be his own Bible; that there is no authoritative standard of interpretation; and that, consequently, whatever a man believes the Scriptures to say, to him they *do* say it. We are well aware that they will indignantly fling back upon us the charge, and call us papists for making it, just in the same way as the Tractarians will designate us “Dissenters” for not adopting all *their* views; but we must still maintain, that to deny the existence of an authoritative standard of interpretation, is to make every man his own interpreter, and every man’s prejudices his own faith. He, therefore, who, with a sound judgment, looks at the Primitive Church, first, as exhibited to him through the imaginative and highly-coloured medium of Mr. Newman, and then in the baleful light shed over it by the torch of Isaac Taylor, will hardly fail to obtain something like a just knowledge of the subject. He will not obtain the information of the scholar—he must not depend upon minute particulars, but he will yet have taken a panoramic view of a field which should be wholly unknown to none. We have been led into these remarks, by reflecting on the duties of the Episcopate, and the different treatment which the Bishops, both of antiquity and of our own day, have experienced at the hands of those who were and are, doubtlessly, good men. That a Bishop who bestows his patronage upon A should be misrepresented by B is, however lamentable, a result to be expected. We are never surprised at the irregular clergyman’s dislike of his disciplinarian superior; but we do sorrow much, when we see the fame of those departed “in the faith and fear” of God many years ago, made the theme of violent discussion, and the football of party spirit.

The proper mode in which to view the Episcopal authority is to consider the Bishop—

1. As the Prelate—the Ecclesiastical Head of his diocese.
2. As the Pastor—the Spiritual Guide of his diocese.
3. As the Divine—the Theological Leader of his diocese.
4. As the Peer—the Legislative Representative of his diocese.

Under these four heads are all the Episcopal duties comprised; nor let it be supposed that the political part of those duties springs from modern and adventitious circumstances. It is quite true that, in the early ages of the Church, there were no *Lord* Bishops, because there were then no *Christian* councils of state; but directly Christianity was publicly recognized, and it became possible for nations, *as such*, to acknowledge their obligations to obey the divine law, then the ministers of that law were called to assist in the legislature, and the codes of all Europe bear testimony to the beneficial effects of such provision. Never was equity more equitably administered in this country than when a Bishop was always Lord Chancellor. Wolsey, ambitious as was his character, and worldly as were his designs, is yet allowed by one who was well acquainted with his conduct, “to have spared neither high nor low, but to have judged every estate according to their merits and deserts.” We should be sorry to see the Chancellorship restored to the Episcopal order; for even then, when the duties of the Bishops were less urgent, they were neglected for those of a judicial character. Fox, Bishop of Winchester, who was Chancellor during part of the reign of Henry VIII., says, in a letter to Cardinal Wolsey, “Truly, my singular good Lord, syns the Kynges grace lycenced me to remayne in my chyrche, and thereabouts, upon my cure, wherein I have been almost by the space of xxx yeres so neglegen, that of foure several cathedral chyrches that I have had successyvely, there be two, scilicet Excestre and Wellys, that I never see, and innumerable sowls whereof I never see the bodyes; and specially syns by hys lycence I left the keepinge of hys privy seale, and most specially syns my laste departynge fro your goode lordship and the counsell I have determyned, and betwixt God and me utterly renouncyed the medlyng with worldly maters.” We should be very sorry to see such a state of things as this restored; but justice to the Episcopal order requires an acknowledgement that the law was admirably administered by the Bishops, and that under their management the Court of Chancery was a court of strict equity. They were councillors of state in the times of the first Christian Emperors; they had a voice in the deliberations of the Gothic Kings who succeeded; they had their separate

house in France ; and, in fine, there never has been a nation making a public profession of Christianity in which the chief ministers of religion have not had a share of authority ; and it is to their humanity and learning, their practical wisdom and their devotional feeling, that we owe nearly all that is valuable in our more ancient laws. Was the mail-clad baron, who could not read, but who most characteristically signed his deeds with the engraved hilt of his sword, best fitted to judge of political expediency, or the lordly prelate, whose lettered leisure had been passed amidst the records of past wisdom : who could trace the course of events along the stream of history to ascertain their consequences, or roll them backward to develope their causes ? Whether was the more likely to lean to the side of mercy and moderation—the legislator

“ Whose dinted casque and bucklers plight
Bore the signs of a stubborn fight ? ”

the man whose fierce and more than semi-predatory habits made both life and property lose their sanctity in his eyes—the turbulent noble, whose sword was drawn alternately to controul his sovereign and to oppress his neighbours—or the dignified ecclesiastic, ambitious if you will, unspiritual if you will, but who nevertheless had felt (before it was a common-place to quote it) that

“ *ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros ?* ”

But though we might enlarge, to a very considerable extent, on the advantages which Europe has derived from Episcopal influence in legislation, we should prefer, on the present occasion, to speak of Bishops, as they exist in this country, and at this time. We shall assume (for we write to churchmen) that it is proper to commit the government of the Church to an order distinct from, and higher than, the presbytery ; we shall assume that the order so governing the Church should be admitted to a share in the councils of the State ; and we shall rest satisfied with the coronation oath, which binds the Sovereign, under whatever Ministry the machinery of State may be carried on, to maintain the Reformed Catholic Church as at present established. Now, with this view, applying our four-fold division of the Episcopal duties to the living Prelates of our day and nation, we shall be struck with the extreme fidelity with which they are fulfilled. Yet, because the idiosyncrasy of men's minds will always exhibit itself, and lead us to view the men under different phases, we shall find that, as each particular division of these duties impresses itself on the mind of the Bishop, with a greater or less vividness, according to the constitution of that mind, so one will

be more remarkable for his diocesan activity and judgment—another for his soundness of theological and scholastic attainments—a third for the pure spirituality of his life and government—and a fourth for the energy with which he devotes himself to defending the assailed rights and properties of the Church. The others may not be neglected, but it will be *one* which characterizes the Bishop.

We shall be made sensible of this if we cast our eyes along the present bench—a bench distinguished above that of any other age by learning, talent, piety, and judgment. Much as we detest the proceedings of our present Ministers—little as we account either of their patriotism or their religion—we are yet impressed with gratitude to the Almighty that their Episcopal patronage has been well exercised. There may possibly—though we put this merely as a possibility—have been men having stronger claims to the Mitre than Drs. Longley, Otter, Bowstead, Davys, and Denison; but *even if so*, none could have been found more fitted for their high station, more qualified to adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things—in their private life; their characters as scholars, Christians, and gentlemen; in their zeal and activity, in their freedom from revolutionary partizanship,* in the extent and variety of their attainments, in their unassuming piety, and in their conciliating manners—none could be found among *any party* more adapted to adorn the bench, and the Church has reason indeed to thank the Supreme Disposer of all events, that a Ministry, which evidently “cared for none of these things,” should have been led to make choice of such men. Dr. Musgrave, too, though his elevation occasioned no little surprise, is a most active, useful, and exemplary Prelate; and with regard to Dr. Stanley, the most unpopular, perhaps, of all their appointments, we shall quote the opinion expressed by the most decided, and certainly one of the most eminent of Tory publications. Speaking of some part of the Bishop’s conduct, which the writer deemed it necessary to condemn, he says, “This conduct arose, in a great measure, from his own frank and unsuspecting temper—he may have supposed that all men were as well disposed as he was himself.”† Again, “We must notice the admirable spirit and temper with which Bishop Stanley behaved towards Archdeacon Bathurst; the latter felt aggrieved, because, having walked in all the ways of his father, the late Bishop, his hereditary Whig-Radicalism did not make the see of Norwich an heir-loom in the family of Bathurst; he

* It must be acknowledged and lamented that most of the lately created Bishops voted for the Appropriation clause.

† Fraser’s Magazine, November, 1839.

took an early opportunity of interfering, and that, too, in a very ungentlemanlike way, with the Episcopal functions of Dr. Stanley; and most mildly and quietly, yet most effectually, did the Bishop repress him." After having spoken thus much of late appointments, we might proceed to instance, by way of showing in what way the four-fold duties of the Episcopate should be discharged, the examples of the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Chester, and Exeter. We are, however, quite sensible that the task would be too delicate—quite persuaded that the rest of the bench, though *we* know less of their labours, are not behind their brethren—quite aware that these excellent Prelates seek not the praise of men, but the glory of God; and that the undertaking, difficult in itself, would be made still more so by the necessity under which we should be placed of taking a portrait, as it were, of every individual in a different light—of presenting the reader with a one-sided view of each character, in order to illustrate our ideas of the Episcopate generally. Fortunately, they are *all* allowed to be active and eminently useful Prelates—*all* to be scholars of the very highest class—*all* to be admirable divines—and *all* to be conscientious and consistent legislators. We speak of their present state and opinions—we are neither inclined nor obliged to search whether their political or theological sentiments have suffered any change; we take them as we find them, and are quite sure that we should not speak too highly of them. Circumstances have brought these Bishops more prominently before the world than the majority of the rest, and thus their names have suggested themselves to our minds as illustrations, or we should not have particularized even so far as this.

The duties of the Prelate are in no points more important than those which relate to discipline and patronage. It forms no part of our present design to notice the proposed Discipline Bill; we will only observe, *en passant*, that the more power be lodged in the hands of the Bishops, the better will that power be exercised. Nothing requires more judgment, nothing more intrinsic amiability of character, than to have authority over a large body of men, all equals by office, all differing in station; and, to no small degree, all differing, also, in amount of education and talent. The clergy, as a body, are, without doubt, a learned body; but the amount of literature that may fairly be deemed satisfactory in the literati ordained to some remote district in Wales or Northumberland would be thought very insufficient in the graduate of Cambridge or Oxford: and here, too, we find the regular gradation from the lowest of the "*οἱ πολλοί*," or "pass-men"—from those who at Cambridge are facetiously called "Elegant Extracts," and placed

in a list by themselves as unworthy to be classed at all—to the men who have carried away all the highest honours of the year. But the inequality, in point of learning, is by no means the only, or even the most important, inequality subsisting among the clerical body. It is composed of men of all kinds of *home education*: some brought up in the lap of affluence, men of rank, and family, and fortune, with *all* the intermediate classes down to the son of the artisan, or even of the labourer. Men, too, of all characters and dispositions are part and parcel thereof. We do not mean to assert that *all* characters are so common as to make any impression upon the community, but specimens of all characters are to be found; and it is but too evident that there is a large class on whom the feelings of religion are insufficient to keep down the workings of ambition, or the ebullitions of party spirit.

It must be remembered, too, that the Episcopal rule is not a military despotism; it is stringent only upon certain points, and leaves free latitude upon others. A clergyman, if beneficed, may neglect nearly the whole of his duties without bringing himself within the reach of his diocesan; he may embroil his parishioners, may neglect the poor and the sick, may preach a mere cold and profitless morality, may live an openly worldly life, be continually leaving his church, and providing inadequate supplies; may be haughty, insolent, and overbearing—yet, if he abstain from gross vice, the power of the Bishop will not extend so far as to punish him. Nay, there may be strong suspicions against his moral character; there may be even proof, in point of conscience, of his delinquency, but if that evidence does not amount to legal proof, the Bishop must sit still—he has no power to interfere; he would be accused of violating vested rights, and bring upon himself the ill-will of his clergy. A curate may be dealt with more summarily—his licence might be withdrawn; but even *here* public opinion will have some weight, and no Bishop would take a step so decided without having full conviction of its necessity. Thus a curate may, if he be at once captious, and quarrelsome, and cautious—qualities by no means rare—occasion his diocesan considerable annoyance; may tease him with frivolous complaints and plausible misrepresentations; may induce him to interfere in cases where no interference was necessary; or may throw himself into the arms of some semi-dissenting society, which will gladly support him against his superior. These are difficulties which beset every Bishop in carrying out measures of discipline. But to these are to be added many peculiar to each diocese; and all must be considered and

compared with the present state of that diocese, before we are at liberty to form a judgment as to the measures of the present Bishops. The clergy of London, for instance, are more migratory than those of any other city. The great expense of living is not compensated by any greater amount of salary; and those only can afford to hold curacies in the metropolis who have either some other employment, such as tuition or literature, who have independent property, or who are single and very plain living men. A man must be endowed with a genius for economy, if he is to live in London on the proceeds of a London curacy. The number of new churches, too, continually rising up in and around the capital, take off a proportion of the curates, whose places are supplied by men already in orders from distant provinces. It is probable that not above one-third of the clergy engaged in this important diocese have ever been ordained by Bishops of London.

It is difficult to ascertain from what source the idea arises, but there prevails extensively an opinion, that a man of "pulpit talent" is sure of a brilliant career in the metropolis. Croly, Melvill, and some half-dozen others, seem but the type of a class: a curacy is to be obtained in London, no matter in what part, crowds will flock around the orator; religious societies will weary him with applications for sermons and speeches at meetings; presents of plate and books will attest the respect of the wealthy; and the Bishop, attracted by his growing celebrity, will come to hear him with a view of collating him to the first vacant living in his gift! Strange as it may seem, this is really not an exaggerated picture; and the expectations so bright, but so delusive, bring up annually from the country a crowd of aspirants for metropolitan pulpits. Another cause of the migratory character of the London clergy is the great number of official situations in and about that city, which, while they require the holder to be in orders, yet preclude any parochial duty; these, which have, not unfrequently, the advantage of respectable salaries, are considered by many highly desirable—so much so, indeed, that not a few clergymen undertake curacies in the capital with a view to obtaining one of them by making interest in case of a vacancy. Now it is evident that discipline can be exercised only at considerable disadvantage over a body whose elements are continually shifting.

Another difficulty in maintaining an effective discipline in the diocese of London arises from the nature of the city patronage. It has been cut up into as small pieces as possible, yet leaving many rich prizes undivided. A living may be a

valuable one; but there is very likely an endowed afternoon lecture, and another in the evening—here, then, are three separate pieces of preferment, each, perhaps, independent of the others: the one may lie in the gift of a company, another of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, and the third of the parishioners. The rector, perchance, may be non-resident, and thus, by appointing a curate, he adds a fourth minister to a small church in a small parish—three of whom are independent entirely of one another, and nearly so of the Bishop. The number of attendants at the parish church may not be more than twenty, and yet these four clergymen are maintained to do the duty that might be performed by one. Now, it is very evident, that could these lectureships be permanently joined to the curacies, a great advantage would be obtained, and not a few qualified persons set at liberty to take duty where there is more need of assistance; but if the lectures be endowed, and the election vested in any party, the alteration is all but impossible. Again, there are cases where the lectureship is founded upon the voluntary principle, and the lecturer paid solely by pews-rents or subscriptions. Here, though the Bishop may, without doubt, interfere if he pleases, and require that the curate should undertake the lecture; still the parishioners, deeming their rights invaded, would very probably withdraw their subscriptions, or allow the pews to remain unlet. Thus an opposition arises to the Bishop's intention, which can with great difficulty, if at all, be surmounted. Nothing need be said of the number of chaplaincies, readerships, &c. which bring their holders very little under Episcopal superintendence; nothing upon the facilities which a residence in a great city affords to objectionable conduct of all descriptions; nothing again of the system of proprietary chapels, by which a clergyman is rendered accountable, not so much to the Bishop, as to the trustees—all these things require only mentioning to show that, in the very nature of things, an effective system of discipline is extremely difficult in the diocese of London.

We will briefly recapitulate. The metropolis—attracting as it does the ambitious, the gay, and those who have corporate interest; furnishing the dissolute, if such there are, with opportunities of indulgence and facilities for escape—is of itself a diocese the government of which is sufficiently arduous. The task is rendered still more so by the nature of the patronage and the character of the parishes: there are a large number of the clergy almost withdrawn from Episcopal rule; and, as if this were not enough, there is added the management of a diocese (exclusive of the capital) equal in population and importance

to any other in the kingdom. Such is the description of that portion of our state ecclesiastical over which the Bishop of London wields the crozier.

We have taken the diocese of London as the subject of our remarks on discipline, not only because we are writing in the midst of it, and have, therefore, better opportunities for observing its condition, but because all the difficulties which occur in any other diocese, occur there in a still greater degree. To a certain extent, all great cities are difficult to govern, and present greater obstacles, in the way of a paternal rule, than a country district can possibly do; hence the dioceses of London, Chester, and Bristol, will be the best examples we can take as to the state of discipline. But when we find that *here* the clergy are sedulous and attentive to their duties, sound in doctrine, active among their people, promoting the education of the young, quiet and loyal Christians, but not partisans in politics; when we see new churches continually erected, and old meeting-houses continually shut up; when we find congregations increasingly numerous, and communicants at once more and more devout: we feel that, whatever may be the difficulties which are presented to the enforcement of discipline, they are triumphantly overcome, and that both the Bishops and the subordinate clergy are actuated by one spirit. After all, it is the *laity*, and not the *clergy*, to whom we are to look as evidences of an efficient church discipline. It is the laity who fill the churches: would they fill them to hear the cold, dry exposition of a profitless, because baseless, morality? Would they throng them to listen to men whose lives notoriously belied their doctrines? Did they do so in times now, we trust, for ever past? The success of Methodism, and the thousand-and-one other shapes of the Proteus—Dissent, supply the answer. It is useless to shut our eyes to facts, and trust only to theories. The Church has, doubtless, a *right* to our allegiance; doubtless, it is not a mere matter of opinion, whether we will belong to that visible body which is apostolically constituted, or to any invented by man's ingenuity. But while we acknowledge all this—aye, and more still—we feel that the Church, with her manifold blessings, must be brought home to the bosoms of men, if she is to be to them the means of salvation. It may be very sublime to build in some shady grove, far from the haunts of men, the magnificent cathedral; to consecrate the very atmosphere around it to silence and devout retirement: to allow no sounds, save those of prayer ascending from the lips of the white-robed priest, or the deep thunders of praise from the organ, as they roll along the lofty arches of the

fretted roof; to hallow the light by making it pass through "storied windows richly dight" with the pictured legend of martyr or apostle:—all this may be, and is, solemn and sublime. It may elevate the feelings of the poetical, and please the taste of the refined—but will it correct the errors of the labourer and the artisan, whose minds have had no time to become refined? Will it associate with their everyday life and common wants? Will it appeal to the feelings of men ground down by poverty and hardened by oppression? Will it allure the chartist from his club, and the socialist from his parallelogram, to plod, perhaps, miles to join in a worship far too destitute of sympathy with their feelings to attract them for its own sake? We know very well that it will not. Religion, by those who treat it thus, is made very poetical. It appeals powerfully to the imagination; it is sensuous without being sensual. But the imagination is not the faculty by which we are to lead the poor and the uneducated. Chartism and Socialism are more cunningly contrived to mislead, than a religion like this to guide—they appeal to the passions and feelings of men; *they* offer him bread for his family, and immunity for himself; *they* tell him to indulge his appetites, and assure him that for all these things God will *not* bring him into judgment. The hook, so skilfully baited, is seized as eagerly; and the victims, thus led captive by Satan, are not to be reclaimed by the pomp of cathedral service, or even the thunders of sacerdotal excommunication.

A sound state of discipline, enforced by wise Bishops, and cordially acquiesced in by a spiritually-minded clergy, is gradually working wonders in the religious world. The ministers of God have visited their flocks; they have not confined themselves to the services of the sanctuary, but they have gone about, encouraging the feeble-minded, confirming the faint, instructing the ignorant, consoling the sick, holding out the promises of Christ to the dying. The school, as well as the pulpit, has become accustomed to their voice; the rich and the poor have become alike personally acquainted with their pastor, *and the church is full!* Other churches have sprung up around the old ones; and in the dioceses of London and Chester upwards of one hundred and fifty have been built within the last twelve years. The Gospel has been thus brought home to those who *would* not have gone out of their way to receive it. Those who were ignorant of its importance have been informed that "godliness, with contentment, is great gain;" and they have had examples continually brought before their eyes, lest they should deem it a mere delusion of priestcraft. Here the socialist and the chartist are met upon their own ground; the emissaries of

God are as active as the emissaries of Satan, and the proposition is fairly brought before the poor and the ignorant. "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him."

And this part of our subject brings us to notice two societies which have been eminently useful in increasing the efficiency of our Church. They are the Additional Curates' Society and the Pastoral Aid Society. Acting upon the principles which we have been illustrating, viz., that Religion is neither too refined for the ignorant, nor too dignified for the laborious, they have multiplied the Ministers of our Church, and sent them forth into the highways and hedges to compel men to come in. The former of these societies is, by all parties, acknowledged to be *faultless*: on the latter, as a matter of discipline, we shall hazard a few remarks. It is objected to it, that, though its committee is composed, in equal portions, of clergymen and laymen, yet the duties of the clerical portion, for the most part, keep them away, and the management of the society falls, therefore, chiefly into the hands of the laity. Now, though we entertain not the slightest doubt that the society would be more efficacious were its committee composed only of clergy, we yet conceive that those who stay away from their places in the committee have themselves to blame if laymen obtain an undue influence. We have been told, and are inclined to believe, that this influence has been occasionally exerted in an injudicious manner. It is to be expected that clergymen would more exactly comprehend, and more readily enter into, the feelings of their brethren than laymen. The latter are too apt, in cases like the present, to consider the clergymen, for whose stipends they afford grants, simply as the machines by which a certain object is to be obtained. We willingly allow that the Redeemer's glory is the great object that they have in view, but they should, nevertheless, as far as possibly consistent with that object, consult the feelings and the *interests* of those ministers whom they are the means of sending into God's vineyard. That no acts of harshness are chargeable upon the society, is partly to be attributed to the admirable and truly Christian spirit of Mr. Pullen and Mr. Harding, the clerical secretaries. Another regulation of the society is that by which testimonials are required to be presented to themselves before the appointment of a curate on their grant is confirmed.* This

* While we retain our opinion on this subject, it is but fair to state that the Bishops of Winchester, Chester, Ripon, Lichfield, and Norwich, who, with six other prelates, are vice-patrons of the society, give this part of its proceedings their avowed approbation. At present nearly two hundred curates are paid by this society, at an expense of not much short of 18,000*l.* per annum, and their labours extend over a population of two millions.

we do most deeply lament. It is a stumbling-block in the way of the society, which has prevented many from subscribing—many incumbents from applying for aid—and many curates from accepting appointments where the stipend was secured by its grants. We hope, before long, to see this obstacle removed. Another objection, in which we cannot so fully sympathise, is the occasional employment of lay agency. Now, as the lay agents in question are confined to *lay duties*—duties which devolve upon all men who have any opportunity of fulfilling them—we acknowledge that we cannot see the infraction of discipline complained of. To read the Scriptures to those who cannot read them for themselves; to urge those to attend public worship who have hitherto neglected it; to collect statistical information; to instruct in Sunday Schools; to persuade parents to send their children thither; to be the pioneer of the clergyman—all these are offices which require no special ordination, which any one may undertake, and which all to the best of their ability are bound to fulfill. But even the possibility of any irregular conduct is provided against by making these “lay agents” to act under the direction of the incumbent, and to be accountable to him for their proceedings.

There is, we think, only one remaining complaint against the Pastoral Aid Society, which is, that they sometimes clog their grants with conditions. To this it may be answered, that if any incumbent chooses to accept a grant of money under certain conditions, he is bound to fulfill those conditions without complaining: but an instance has lately come under our notice, which we will state. The rector of a populous parish in a large city, non-resident from ill-health, applied for a grant to this society; a curate was nominated by him, and accepted by the society, and licensed by the Bishop, the rector expressly agreeing to pay a sum equal to that provided by the society, in order that there might be two resident curates exclusively devoted to the service of the parish. Subsequently to this, a clergyman, who was considered a popular preacher, offered to take the second curacy for a smaller sum than that stipulated in the agreement between the rector and the society; the latter, taking into consideration that the living was a small one, and the clergyman referred to independent of the stipend, acceded to the arrangement, and also consented that the latter, contrary to their recorded agreement, should continue, together with his curacy, a more lucrative employment elsewhere. Here we have an example of very great consideration on the part of the society; they might, of course, have said, “We shall suspend our grant till the conditions are complied with:” but they chose rather to give way, though

they were not without provocation which would have abundantly excused them, had they thought it necessary to have insisted upon the performance of the agreement.

We have noticed these societies, chiefly, because it is to them that the increased and increasing efficiency of the Church, in more than one diocese, is in no small degree to be ascribed. We return, however, to the present state of Church discipline, and to the tacit attestation afforded thereto by the laity. Formerly, if we may credit contemporaneous publications, instances of clerical delinquency were by no means uncommon; indeed, if a clergyman lived an outwardly correct life, a very great degree of worldly-mindedness would not only be excused, but even admired, as exhibiting a laudable freedom from fanaticism and enthusiasm. Now, the bitterest enemies of the Establishment, ever on the watch, can but rarely find an example of an immoral clergyman. This is much to say; and it is abundantly proved by the outcry made very lately about a case, lamentable indeed, but which would once have been passed over by public opinion as nothing uncommon. We now scarcely open a newspaper without finding some testimonial of respect to a clergyman; sometimes a Bible subscribed by the pennies of the poor, who take this means of expressing their affectionate sense of his faithful ministrations; sometimes a service of plate; and sometimes, as in the noble instance of the Vicar of Bolton-le-Moors, we find the present itself re-presented to the Church: "I can do without another service of plate (said Mr. Slade); employ the money in the building of a Church, and I will gladly contribute myself." This good understanding between the clergy and their flocks is on the increase, and is a fact that speaks volumes as to the efficacy of our present Church discipline.

We now turn to another branch of the Episcopal duties; and we shall here also see the bench as honourably distinguished. We allude to the exercise of *patronage*. We must, in order to come to a right understanding of this subject, first ascertain who are the proper objects of Episcopal patronage in its several departments. The Bishop has in his gift, usually, considerable cathedral and parochial preferment; the cathedral preferment is intended for those who by their pens defend the doctrine and discipline of Christ's Church, who shed around it the light of learning, and lead to the altar, as handmaids to true religion, literature, and science, and philosophy, *truly* so called. It is for men who, erudite and accomplished, can render more service by their cloistered retirement, than by being plunged into the labour and anxiety of parochial duty. These men occupy their own appointed place in the hosts of the Lord; they may be regarded

as the armourers of that phalanx which is to overcome "the world, the flesh, and the devil;" they are forging those bright weapons with which popery, and schism, and heresy, and infidelity, are to be transfixed; furnishing "reasons for the faith that is in them" to thousands who would otherwise have none to render; clearing away difficulties from the text, and apparent contradictions from the meaning of Scripture; and proving that our Church has faithfully handed down to us the "faith once delivered to the saints." He who is able, when hard pressed by a more skilful but less principled opponent, to reply in the words, or with the arguments, of one of our Christian champions, will find, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if he chooses to make the enquiry, that it was to cathedral preferment that man owed the leisure to write, by whose labours *he* has been preserved from perversion. Now, it seems, this source of profit to our Christianity, and therefore of support to our State, is to be cut short by the suicidal hands of Government. If any proof were here required upon a subject which it is not the object of our present article to treat, we would refer the reader, first to Mr. Glover's admirable work, "*The Fruits of Endowment*;" and next, to the paucity of great theological writers produced by the Establishment of Scotland, an establishment unprovided with cathedral preferment.

The literary man must and should look to the literary public—the scientific man to the scientific world—the theologian to the vacant stalls, now so miserably curtailed. But where must the active and useful parish priest look—the man who has been toiling for, perhaps, ten years as the laborious curate of some populous and important parish? We reply, he is *one* of the objects, the proper objects, of that parochial patronage vested in the Bishop. The exercise of this parochial patronage is one of the most important trusts committed to the Episcopal body. If an undeserving person be thrust into a prebend or a canonry, the amount of the mischief done is easily calculated; a serviceable person is deprived of his due, and the world of a portion of his services. But who shall calculate the injury done to the souls of men, by making a godless minister the rector of a large parish? The neglect of warning, the non-performance of much official duty, and the cold performance of the rest; the force of a careless example, the encouragement given to heresy and schism; the paucity of public ministrations, and the total absence of private ones—all make up a fearful amount of criminality, chargeable, in no slight degree, on the party who placed that man in a situation for which he was so ill fitted. The great charge brought against Bishops, in the disposal of benefices, has been that of Nepotism. Now, in order

to make this charge valid, those who make it should be prepared to show that the sons and nephews of Bishops, thus preferred, are absolutely disqualified for the stations in which family partiality has placed them. It will not be sufficient to show that better men might have been chosen, for a Bishop is not expected to do an impossibility: viz., to prefer always the best man in his diocese—but to choose a man competent to the duties of the vacant post, and willing to undertake them. The person preferred is not disqualified by being the son, the nephew, or the grandson of a Bishop—nay, if he be a worthy man, there is an evident propriety in his preferment, for the Prelate certainly knows more of his qualifications than he does of those possessed by numberless other persons in his diocese, among whom there are, in all probability, many better than the person preferred. Dr. Sparke, the late Bishop of Ely, has been frequently quoted as an instance of nepotism; but we have yet to learn that the diocese of Ely, under his government, was worse administered than others, or that the members of the Bishop's family were not exemplary in discharging the duties which devolved on them in consequence of Dr. Sparke's patronage. We think that the members of Episcopal families, unless disqualified by misconduct, are proper objects of the Bishop's patronage. Another class of proper objects are men of rank and title; and we can easily imagine cases in which the preferment of such men shall be highly expedient, unless they be also men of large fortune. We will suppose a benefice of considerable value vacant; it is in the gift of a Bishop, and his view in filling it up should be, and doubtless is, to promote the glory of God, *by promoting the efficiency of the Church*. Now, we will also imagine two persons recommended to that Bishop; the one a laborious and useful curate, the other an equally pious and useful nobleman, the younger son of a peer, whose income is small and whose patronage is scanty. It may be said by many that the poor curate should be preferred—and if he were, certainly no harm, but much good, would be done; but if the Lord John or Lord Thomas, whose equal zeal and piety recommended him to the notice of his diocesan, be presented, we think still greater benefit would accrue to the Church and to the parish. The credit and character of the clergy, as a body, though it needs not any adventitious splendour, is raised, in the eye of the mass, by any accession to its ranks of the titled and powerful. A person possessing such claims to distinction, *besides* those of zeal and piety, is in a position to advance the interests of the Church, far more than a man of equal ministerial qualifications, but of humbler origin. For the same causes, there are instances in which rich men are to be preferred to poor, because they may, and in many cases will,

expend much of their substance, in bettering the condition of the parishes over which they are appointed to preside. It is true that the one can purchase preferment, which the other cannot. But it must be remembered that money is a worldly thing, and will be looked upon, both by rich and poor, in a worldly light. The man who purchases, expects that his purchase shall produce him a certain per centage; and he will, in one way or other, realize his expectation. We know not a few instances in which preferment has been *given* to rich men, that they have expended the whole of their clerical incomes in salaries to curates. We have, at this moment, a parish in our mind where there are six curates, among whom the income of the living, 700*l.* per annum, is divided. But while we state thus much, as to our opinions of promoting the rich and noble, we would not be misunderstood; our remarks are elicited by examples which we have before us, and from our having attentively examined their effects. To prefer the claims of the rich to the claims of the poor, is, at all times, an unpopular step; and to which a Christian Bishop is, from many causes, naturally averse. Yet, when we find this step taken, as we not unfrequently do, we shall see that it is taken in obedience to the dictates of a stern conscientiousness; that the Bishop has preferred the welfare of the Church to the welfare of a meritorious individual, and sacrificed his private feelings to his public duty. But if it be easy to defend the conduct of our Bishops in bestowing their patronage upon men of fortune, and on the scions of noble houses, how much more easy is it to vindicate them when they are accused of neglecting literary merit. To charge a Blomfield, a Sumner, or a Kaye, with indifference to high mental attainment, is a contradiction in terms. We think we shall not wrong these exemplary Prelates, if we say that the savour of their own college retirement still remains about them; they still look, with an interest not diminished by their own removal to higher stations and sterner duties, on the studies in which they so eminently excelled their fellows; but, however much they may be disposed to reward literary proficiency, they feel that it is not by the cure of souls, or the emoluments attached to such cure, that the eminence of learned men is to be recompensed. A man may, perhaps, be brilliantly learned, and he may have languished all his life in a poor curacy; his heart may have sickened with hope deferred, and his children have pined in helpless penury; but, if no other means of raising him to comfort occur, and he be not a useful parish priest, his learning or his genius will afford no grounds for committing to his hands the cure of souls. Authorship, the task of education in some shape or other, these should be his resource. He may be an object for

cathedral preferment, but not for parochial patronage. Let any man, acquainted with the state of the clergy, consider, for a moment, the utter impossibility under which the Bishops labour, of providing, even for the tenth part of those, who are at once exemplary, and in distressed circumstances; and he will acknowledge, without hesitation, that no number of meritorious men, in a state of poverty, will be sufficient to give validity to a charge against the Bishops. Again, if the literary man is not the fit object for Episcopal patronage, what shall be said for the mere popular preacher, the man who makes the pulpit the theatre for display; whose studied action, and flowery language, and *ad-captandum* arguments, carry away the million, but who passes over the rest of his duties as merely supplementary?—the preacher, but not the minister—who regards a lecture to a few poor parishioners, as an encroachment upon his time? who bestows his study on the polishing of his Sunday harangues, and his leisure in visiting his professed admirers? Such men, and such there are, cannot be fit persons to be advanced by the chief pastors of Christ's Church. We have many splendid instances of preachers, popular by their talent, valuable for their learning, and useful for their laborious and pious exertions among their flocks. Such men are frequently preferred by our living Bishops. It would be invidious to make selections; but, just to prove our position, we take the two first instances that occur to our minds: Mr. Dale, of St. Bride's, and Mr. McGrath, of St. Ann's, Manchester, and scores of equally satisfactory cases might be produced. We should not have drawn our picture of the mere popular preacher, the original of which is fast becoming, (at least in the Church,) an extinct species, had it not frequently been made a ground of complaint against the Prelates of the day, that eminent preachers received no favour at their hands. The objects then of parochial patronage, when vested in the hands of a Bishop, are good, active, indefatigable, ministers. Rank and wealth, we think, should, in some cases, be preferred to learning and talent, simply because the parish over which the party is placed, may be more benefitted thereby, and because also learning and talent should be recompensed by cathedral patronage; and where this greater benefit to the parish cannot be reasonably expected, then this very rank and wealth afford a reason for postponing the claims of the possessors. All qualifications are, however, to give way to activity and piety. Taking this view of Episcopal duties, in the disposal of preferment, we fearlessly claim for our present Bishops the praise both of prudence and consistency.

From the duties which devolve on the Prelate, let us pass to those which devolve on the Pastor and the Theologian. The chief pastor—the superintendent of the shepherd—to whom the clergyman is to look for advice, should be a man of spiritual mind himself; he should understand, in all the length and breadth, the rich promises of God. Now, so far as human evidence can extend, we have proof that such are the men to whom the government of the Church is committed. We cannot see their hearts, but we can watch their lives, and read their works. Is it not easy to distinguish beneath the courtly polish of the Bishop of Winchester, the true kindness of a Christian minister? Does not the apostolic demeanour of the Bishop of Chester reflect back the picture of the Christian character, so admirably portrayed in his works; and are not these mere outward signs borne out by still stronger proof? Are not these Prelates in constant and most affectionate communication with *all* classes of the clergy? And were they, or the truly venerable Primate, ever approached without feelings of love as well as of reverence? We might ask the same questions concerning the other Bishops, for we know that those whom we have named form no exceptions to the rule; and the answers would shew us that the Episcopal Government in our Church, as at present administered, is administered in the spirit of the new commandment.

We cannot pass over this part of our subject, without referring to the charges placed at the head of our present article. We do not speak of them as models of composition, as specimens of nervous common sense, though in that view they well merit our notice; but as breathing the spirit of the Gospel, as exhibiting the Episcopal character in its very highest position, as pointing out the way in which the ministers of God should walk; and to which the authors *might* add, “Be ye therefore followers of us, even as we follow Christ.”

We must hasten to the third branch of Episcopal duties, viz., those of the Theologian. And here we have a wide field for investigation. Looking back to the earliest period of the Anglican Church (to confine ourselves to that one region of the Lord's vineyard) we behold our Saxon Bishops freely sacrificing themselves for the spiritual welfare of their flocks. We find them, amidst all the clouds of rapidly advancing superstition, shining like stars through the gloom, and maintaining, in all their purity, the great doctrines of the truth. We find the same order, in subsequent periods, entering, from time to time, their protest against on-coming error—flinging back, in the teeth of Rome, her heresies and her usurpations; and

though unable to prevent the progress of apostacy, preserving in this country a purer doctrine, and a more apostolic discipline, than prevailed in any other. Carrying onward our view, from the æras of Bede and Alcuin, through the reigns of our Norman kings, to the time of Wickliffe, we still find the same zeal and the same theological ability distinguishing our Bishops. True it is, that the enemy had come in like a flood; that Paschasius Radbertus had invented transubstantiation, and many other cunning devices of men had been mixed with Christianity; still the state of doctrine in England will bear a favourable comparison with that of other lands, and it is to our Bishops that we owe the difference. At the Reformation again, the great instruments in that were the Prelates. They stood in the gap, and came forward to the “aid of the Lord against the mighty;” and it is somewhat remarkable that the only English reformers, save Wickliffe, whose labours produced much effect upon the nation at large, were of the Episcopal order. They were the theologians. The strong faith of other martyrs laughed to scorn the thunders of the Vatican; *they* turned the bolts against those who wielded them; they triumphed, not only by dying in defence of the truth, but by proving the truth for which they died. And, from the time of the Reformation to the present, it will be found a general rule that the ablest defenders of our holy religion, the best expositors of God’s word, the most successful champions of our Church, have been those who were called to fill her highest stations—to lead on her armies against the opposing spirit of false doctrine, heresy, and schism—to bear aloft the banner of a well-understood faith before angels and men. Time would fail were we even to recite the names of the Jewells, and the Bulls, and the Warburtons, and the Taylors, and the Horsleys, and the Watsons, who have rendered illustrious their sacred order; nor need we point out the Kayes, and the Blomfields, and the Sumners of the present day. We would speak more especially, at present, of the part taken by such men in the great controversy of the time—the Oxford Theology. It was remarked by a very eminent minister of our Church, some years ago—

“If the *Tracts for the Times* be wrong, we shall best combat them by teaching the truth independently, and not by assailing their positions; the more they are attacked, the more attention will they excite, and every failure of their opponents in argument, every falling short of Christian courtesey, every exhibition of intemperate zeal and party spirit, will but render their success the more certain. Few persons are qualified to oppose them, because few persons are so learned

as their writers : and the argument rests upon historical research. If, on the other hand, their tenets be right, then we *may* not offer any opposition. In one case, therefore, to assail them is inexpedient ; in the other case, unlawful. At the same time, if any one is convinced, first, that he is capable of treating the question with the same research, and, secondly, is willing to treat it in a Christian spirit, let him take his choice ; but the majority of the clergy will do better to preach what they know to be the truth, and to allow that preaching to take its own effect."

The truth of these words has been abundantly proved by the success which has attended the generality of those who have opposed the Tractarians. They have, for the most part, been convicted of want of scholarship, want of gentlemanlike feeling, want of candour, and want of logical power. And much as we regret the publication of the Tracts,—we regret it for no cause more than because it has exhibited to public contempt the deficiencies of many who would otherwise have maintained an unblemished reputation as learned and candid men. We conceive the Tracts to be both erroneous and dangerous ; and we have, in our last number, given both our opinions and the grounds on which we have formed them, without, we trust, any discourtesy towards the accomplished authors of the works in question. We shall continue to wage war with the tenets, to do all we can to stop the progress of the heresy, while we admire the attainments and respect the characters of those who are promoting the one and spreading the other. The words which we have quoted above, embody the spirit in which the Bishops have in general treated the controversy. Some exceptions are, however, to be found. The Bishop of Chester openly expressed his opinions as to the errors of the Tracts ; and the sentiments of the Bishop of London, though not published, yet are sufficiently well known to be of the same character. The Bishop of Oxford, on the other hand, has declared that he can find no fault in them ; and the simple fact that so good and wise a man has thus expressed himself, should make men gentle in their treatment of the persons so characterised : our sympathies, in this matter, go, we confess, with the Prelates of London and Chester. The doctrines of the Tracts are too vitally important to the Church, if true—too awfully dangerous, if false—to be let quietly alone by those who are qualified to decide. Right or wrong, they are spreading ; and their spread is, in no small degree, to be attributed to the rabid fury and blind ignorance of their ordinary assailants. Yet it must not be imagined that, *on the whole*, they have done harm ; they have awakened the Church from her slumbers as to the

authority bestowed upon her; they have caused sound men to reflect upon matters which they had hitherto forgotten; they have, in many cases, made those who would have been latitudinarians, **EVANGELICAL-HIGH-CHURCHMEN**; and these have spread their own sound views of doctrine and discipline. These principles, viz., those of Evangelical-High-Churchmen, which are those of our Liturgy and Articles, are those also of our Bishops. In their charges and sermons we find the most scriptural views of Christian doctrine, combined with the loftiest, the most ennobling, the most apostolical theories of Church authority and discipline. Their avocations prevent them giving themselves up to authorship; but the writings which they have given us breathe the same spirit of Churchmanship and Christianity, each qualifying and exalting the other. Again, in disputed points of doctrine, we shall ever find them the sound advocates of truth. We hope to see Faber raised to the Bench many years before the close of his useful life; and we shall then rank among our highest in station one of our most profound and correct divines—a man from whose writings not a word need be blotted. Dr. Lawrence, in whom the Archbishopric of Cashel expired, like a lamp that gives one glorious flash before its extinction, was another writer of the same class; nor would it be easy to calculate the good effects of his writings upon the Church and the world. Such men are specimens of Evangelical-High-Churchmen. And here we see the mischiefs of the Tractarian controversy. No sooner does a Christian writer, or a Christian minister, speak of the authority committed to the Church and to the Ministers of that Church,—no sooner does he begin to speak of the evils of heresy and the sin of schism—no sooner does he show a zeal for apostolical order and a desire of primitive discipline—than the ignorant and the factious, who cannot distinguish between truth and error, between what Mr. Taylor (though in an injudicious argument) rightly calls “the pure Corinthian and the showy Composite”—open upon him without delay, and he is assailed by a host of men, whose Christianity consists in a Pusey-phobia, and whose Churchmanship may be defined as a Sabbath attendance upon some favourite divine. There is no help for this but time. We cannot expect that the “religious world” shall be highly educated. We know that the amount of information requisite for a degree and for ordination, though much above what men called well-instructed usually possess, is yet but small; and we see by the annual meetings at Exeter Hall, that the “religious world” aforesaid is governed by impulse and by little else. While this is the case, and it is one of

the worst signs of our times, those who pander to excitement will obtain a certain weight in society. He, therefore, who would disseminate evangelical truth and apostolical discipline, must expect opposition and misrepresentation. He must make up his mind, not to persecution, for that is out of date, but to be disowned by all *parties*, and be acknowledged only by those free from party spirit.

We have now considered the Episcopal duties as those of the Prelate, the Pastor, and the Theologian. We come, in the last place, to review those of the Legislator. Even from the period in which the Episcopal order was instituted in this country, it has always been on the side of constitutional privileges that the Bishops have been found. They have sometimes suffered in reputation, often in circumstances, and not a few even now are defrauded of their honest fame, who, in their own day, performed boldly their sacred duties. Mr. Churton, in his admirable work just published, "*The Early English Church*," thus speaks of one of the most haughty and ambitious of Primates, and of another whose memory is far from popular:—

"Neither BECKET, nor STEPHEN LANGTON, who, in King John's time, played as distinguished a part, did much to increase the dominion of the Pope in England. *It was one who is generally passed over by our historians, WILLIAM OF CORBOIL, the French priest, who brought the yoke upon the neck of the English Church.* This is the very essence of Popery, to give the Pope the authority of Universal Bishop, and to act only as his deputy. Other errors, and superstitions, and bad practises may be remedied: but if there is only one authority in the Church, from which all reformation must come, we are without hope till the *Pope* is pleased to grant it. Stephen Langton is a remarkable person in Church history, as having made the convenient division of the Bible into chapters, as we still keep it. He was a diligent preacher and commentator on Scripture. It is well known that King John and the Monks of Canterbury, being at variance about the election of an Archbishop, Pope Innocent III. took the matter in his own hands, and sent over Stephen Langton, A.D. 1206. He was, however, one who preferred the liberty of his Church and country to the interests of either Pope or King, and he took a leading part in the efforts made by the Barons to procure a better government, in the struggle in which Magna Charta was obtained. It is well known how, in that struggle, the Pope having humbled King John to his heart's content, took his part against the Barons, absolved him from fulfilling the terms to which he had given his promise, and told Langton to excommunicate the champions of liberty. *But he chose rather to abide the Pope's ban with them.*"

And thus, if we continue our survey to the times in which we live, we shall find the interests of the Church and the

nation (as inseparably connected) maintained by the Episcopal order. Nay, so essential a part is it of our constitution, that it fell with royalty and aristocracy ; and when they were restored, it assumed also its appointed place.

The unanimous Conservative feeling of the Church would alone be sufficient to secure a majority of Conservative Bishops; and, indeed, we find that men qualified for so high a spiritual office will rarely submit to be made the tools of any Administration. It had been our intention, when we began this paper, to abstain from particularising any individual Bishop. But, while speaking of that devotion to the rights and interests of the Church, which we have designated as the fourth duty of a Bishop, we cannot refrain from saying a few words on behalf of the much misunderstood and much misrepresented Bishop of Exeter. This accomplished Prelate, by his eloquence and by his sound judgment, has attracted to himself a very large share of the public attention. He, like the Bishop of London, is so active and indefatigable, so perspicacious and persevering, that he at once catches the important bearings of a question, places them in the most prominent point of view, clears away all difficulties, crushes all the efforts of sophistry, and having thus made the subject in dispute plain to the intellect, he then appeals, in the most forcible manner, to the heart and to the conscience. We say, "like the Bishop of London;" and this, because their eloquence, though in many respects different, is yet distinguished by the same high qualities, and both are so skilled in the management of their time and powers, so quick to perceive what must be done by themselves and what may be left to subalterns, that, while their dioceses are admirably attended to, they are themselves able to examine all public events which are, or may be, important to the Church. At the time when the Bishop of Exeter was raised to his present dignity, he was in the enjoyment of a much larger income than so poor a see as Exeter can produce. He was also, by the very act which placed him on the Bench, deprived of the prebend which he held at Durham and the living of Stanhope. He was, at the same time, necessitated to keep up the state of a peer, and to contribute largely, more largely than before, to charitable and religious societies. But not only did he thus suffer in his pecuniary condition from his elevation, but the loss was made more unpleasant from the fact, that they were of the Bishop's own party who required it. It was his political friends who sacrificed his interests; and this with the full conviction that they were adding to their ranks one, before whose intellectual might the stoutest of their enemies would tremble. If

this, then, was the treatment which the Bishop of Exeter met with from the Tories—and it was a poor inducement to hope for any further advancement at their hands: what could he expect from those whose weakness he had exposed, whose arguments he had refuted, whose craftiness he had baffled, and the whole plan of whose policy he had condemned.

We may fairly say, that both the circumstances and the prospects of Dr. Phillpotts were injured by his elevation; and what inducement to accept it could he therefore have, save that of doing good to the Church? He renounced himself, and has stood forward with a noble self-devotion to stay the downward course of our once well-governed country. But this is not all, or even the chief sacrifice, which he has laid on the altar of patriotism. He lost the good opinion of many whose esteem was valuable; and it is only now that he is beginning to be better understood,—now that nearly ten years of constant, zealous, unremitting labour have passed over his head without bringing any other reward than the “answer of a good conscience.” Like many other Prelates, his seniors on the bench, he was led to alter his opinions on the probable consequences of what was called Romish Emancipation: shortly after this he was made Bishop of Exeter. Now, we believe that he would not have been made a Bishop at that moment, had it not been for this change of opinion. Moreover, we feel that his Lordship was right in his previous sentiments, and, therefore, wrong when he altered them. But we have already seen that the see of Exeter could have been no inducement, in itself, for Dr. Phillpotts *to leave his former preferment*; and to suppose, as the galled adversaries of the Bishop pretend to do, that the hope of the mitre could be the *cause* of his altered opinions, is positively absurd. This advocacy of emancipation cost the Bishop the favourable opinion of a large proportion of the clergy, and has embittered the opposition of those who dislike his noble advocacy of the Church. The time is now come for this great and good man to be seen in his true light.

It is worthy of remark that, the presence, in the House of Lords, of a body of dignified ecclesiastics, is the only way in which the clergy can be represented at all. Every other corporate body has its peculiar class out of whom it may choose men qualified to promote its interests. The army and the navy are represented by military and naval officers; the law, by numerous barristers and attorneys; the medical profession, by members from its own ranks. Merchants, bankers, manufacturers, country gentlemen, tradesmen, all have men of their own classes to represent them in one or the other House, and

most in both; but a clergyman must be represented by a lawyer, a banker, a manufacturer, a naval officer, because he cannot give his vote to a member of his own order: hence then, seeing that the interests of that body with which those of the Church are most intimately blended, cannot be represented in the House of Commons at all, it is most fit, were it only as the representatives of the clergy, that the Bishops should sit in the House of Lords, and be *constant, too*, in their attendance. The Members for our Universities represent science and learning; they represent, moreover, certain large corporate interests—but they do not, they cannot, represent the clergy. A dissenting minister may get into Parliament, if he can prevail on any radical constituency to elect him; and the attempt has not unfrequently been made. He may represent as much false doctrine, heresy, and schism, as he thinks fit; but a clergyman is debarred from entering the senate. The constitution has, therefore, provided for this case, by placing all the governing members of the Church in the great Council of State. She has thus hallowed her deliberations, by requiring the presence of God's ministers, and acquired a right to the title of a Christian country, by requiring the sanction of Christian Bishops to her legislative enactments.

Looking at our present Prelates, we find them active and judicious Governors—sincere and affectionate Pastors—learned and orthodox Divines—**EVANGELICAL-HIGH-CHURCHMEN**—sound and consistent Christian Legislators; and it becomes the duty, therefore, not only of clergymen who have sworn canonical obedience to them, but of *all churchmen*, to strengthen their hands—to aid in their holy designs with all the influence that such churchmen can command, with all the wealth they can spare, and with all the prayers they can offer.

ART. II.—*Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England.* Ridgway, Piccadilly. 1839.

THE subject of National Education, always one of the highest importance, has acquired, of late, in this country, a deep and painful interest. And indeed, if ever there were a nation, and a time, when it might justly engross the attention of every true patriot, that nation is England, and that time is the time in which we now live.

Let us reflect for a moment on the present position of our country. Favoured, for near eighteen centuries, with the light

of Christian truth, never wholly extinct, we have for three hundred years, been enjoying its recovered fulness. Our Church, through the gracious Providence of God, has been privileged even above other Protestant churches, by retaining primitive order, along with the revival of pure doctrine. This rare union, within the Church, of spiritual freedom with just authority, has acted on the State itself with a mighty and healing power. Our civil constitution has owned the plastic influence. Reflecting, like a mirror, the tempered harmony of Protestant freedom and Catholic faith retained in the Church, it has blended, in just proportions, the rights of the commoner, the dignity of the noble, and the prerogatives of the throne. The blessing of God has manifestly rested on our land. The haughty thunders of the Vatican have been launched against us in vain; the fleets conjured against us by the wand of that dark enchanter have been scattered on our shores; the plots of Jesuit treachery have perished in the birth; and, in later times, even the wild fury of infidel anarchy that swept over the continent has rolled its tempest around us without the power to harm. We have reached, as a nation, the very pinnacle of outward greatness. Our commerce and our colonies spread through every corner of the globe. With one hand we grasp America—India with the other; and our empire plants its foot on the most southern regions of the earth. The sun, it has been said, never sets on our dominions, and near one-fourth of the world's inhabitants own our sway. The wars of the revolution raised our military fame to its height, and left our navy without a rival on the seas. Surrounding states looked upon our greatness with envy and with wonder; and even now the moral weight of our influence can scarcely be reckoned. And when to these things we add the vast extent of our trade, the maturity of British science, the triumphs of British art and skill, the rich stores of our literature, and our ancestral glories, and, above all, our Christian privileges, our missionary labours, and the hallowing ordinances of the Church of God, we might almost fancy the ocean that surrounds us to be a sea of crystal engirdling an earthly Paradise.

What a glorious prospect would be opened before us, if our advance in morals and religion had kept pace with our external grandeur. But here is the painful contrast. While the British oak spreads its branches so proudly to the world, there is a cankerworm at the root, and rottenness at the core. This queen of nations is smitten with a foul moral leprosy. This mistress of the seas has the plague-spot on her countenance, which marks but too plainly what a deadly disease rages within. The events of

providence and the debates of parliament compel her, year after year, to publish her own weakness and shame. The dense masses of an ignorant and irreligious population in her towns, the incendiary fires of England, the midnight and daylight assassinations of Ireland, the desperate outbreaks of the Chartist, and the more loathsome blasphemies of Socialism, have presented a spectacle, within these few years, which the patriot must gaze upon with the blush of shame, and the Christian mourn over with tears of sorrow.

These evils have now reached a fearful crisis. It is plain that no slight remedies will suffice for a cure. Mere penal laws are felt, even by statesmen themselves, to be unequal to the task. The annual cost of our criminal administration exceeds 1,200,000*l.* and yet crime does not diminish. Men of all parties are beginning to see that our only prospect of national safety lies deeper—in the training of our population to habits of order, morality, and religion. In short, with all classes of thoughtful men, the sheet anchor of their hopes for the country is NATIONAL EDUCATION.

The interest arising from the vital importance of the subject is heightened greatly by the anomalous aspect it has now assumed. In the need of enlarged education for the people all are agreed: but in the views taken of its nature, its machinery, its main objects, and fittest agents, there is the utmost variance. The rulers of the Church are at variance with the rulers of the State; the Upper House condemns the course adopted by the Lower: and in the Commons themselves, party is balanced against party, and five or six votes turn the scale. So that, at the present moment, a few votes of the Lower House, the result of fictitious and perjured Irish registrations, are deciding the basis of our national measures on education, against the loudly-expressed sense of the people, the majority of British members, the express judgment of the House of Peers, and the almost unanimous feeling of the Bishops and Clergy.

It was in this strange and unhappy state of things, that the pamphlet before us appeared. It wears the character of a Government manifesto, to explain and justify the recent measures of our Executive, and to clear them, if possible, from the jealousy and distaste of the Christian public. Some months have now elapsed since its publication; but the causes that gave it birth still continue; the danger that threatens us seems as great as ever; and the importance of the topic is unimpaired. We hope then, with the blessing of God, to do service to our readers and the Church, by submitting it to a brief dissection, and testing its principles in the light of Christian policy and by the lessons of Divine truth.

The pamphlet consists of the Report of Council, June 3, 1839—four chapters, and an Appendix of tabular documents. In the first chapter, facts are adduced upon the state of education in England, to prove the need of Government interference. The second reviews the past course and present state of education on the continent, with the superior resources and actual dangers of England. The third is occupied with a defence of the existing Minute of June 3; and the fourth does the same office for the half-rescinded Minute of the 11th of April. The numerical state of education in Manchester, Liverpool, Bury, York, Westminster, and Coventry, forms the Appendix.

Now the first thing that must strike a Christian reader in this ministerial defence, is the cold, dull, earthly tone which marks it throughout. There is no breadth or fulness in its statement of facts, and there is no frankness or dignity in its vindication of principles. The poor, frigid cast of its thoughts, forms a painful contrast with the intense and overwhelming grandeur of the theme. That our nation has the world at its feet, and corruption preying on its vitals; that we have enjoyed for ages the light of Revelation, with all its bright and immortal hopes, and yet that our rustics are sunk in ignorance, and rebellion and blasphemy ranging through our towns,—these are facts which, brought out in their full relief, might startle the conscience of the public, and sink deep into every Christian heart. But what conscience will be impressed by carving up immortal souls, into averages and per centages, with two places of decimal fractions? Or even if the Bishop of Calcutta could, without garbling of facts, be made evidence against his Grace of Canterbury, how does this help us to sound views of national education, or justify the maxims and plans of Government?

Surely there never was an occasion which called more loudly for clearness and fulness of thought, large and comprehensive views, and a generous fervour of expression. The Government of the first Christian nation in the world bending its thoughts to the high purpose of training millions of immortal souls, and guiding the destinies of unborn ages:—what a noble spectacle for men and for angels! But when we ask for solid thought, our mouth is filled with the pebbles of a sandy arithmetic; when we look for the earnest manliness of the Christian statesman, we find only the tortuous excuses of a creeping expediency.

The next great feature that calls for our notice in this pamphlet, is its total silence upon man's immortality. There are a few expressions, we grant, about "reverence for revealed truth," a sentiment of piety, and gifts of Providence. On the

other hand, to balance these, we have the orthodox faith expounded (p. 46) as "private opinions on abstruse points of theology;" and set in contrast with "the demonstrable temporal happiness of millions." But with regard to man's future account and eternal destiny, the great truth which forms the very touchstone of all sound education,—on this there is the silence of the grave. We are astonished, as well as pained, at this ominous fact. Do my Lords of the Council assign this also to the special department? Can they dream that their manifesto will quiet the scruples of one single Christian, when they will not tell us whether their system is to train men, like horses, as useful animals for state purposes, or as responsible and immortal beings—as pilgrims for eternity?

Here, then, we must pause in our examination. We cannot consent, with the Committee of Council, to bury ourselves in gaols, or wander over the continent for details of instruction or registers of crime, till the great point is first decided,—what is the true object and final aim of all right education. We shall then be more able to form a just decision upon the Government plan.

What, then, is the right aim of National Education? To answer this enquiry, we must reflect on the true aspect of a nation in the sight of God. What is a nation? It is a multitude of immortal, accountable, dying creatures, who are passing through a short pilgrimage to an eternal abode. It is an assemblage, within certain geographical bounds, and cemented by fixed human laws, of thousands and millions who have soon to appear in judgment, and to give an account before the supreme King of Nations, of their conduct here below. It is a noble compartment of that vast field of Divine Providence, concerning which the song always resounds in heaven, "Thou art worthy to receive honour, and glory, and power: for Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they were created." The permanence of a nation is the permanence of the sunshine on the waves of a stream. Each separate drop that now sparkles to the eye, is fast travelling to the ocean; and each of the million immortals that compose the state, is swiftly passing to his solemn account, and his eternal abode.

Such is the Christian view of a nation—a view which none but the blinded Atheist can dare to deny. And now the question recurs, what is the true scope and object of any National Education that deserves the name? And, surely, but one reasonable answer can be given—it is the training of men for their future account and for a blessed immortality. Eternity is too vast to be thrust into a corner, and life is too short to be

squandered upon a lower aim. There is nothing in all its domestic and civil relations, in the fields of natural knowledge, or the range of social duty, which ought not to revolve around this object as the great sun and centre of the whole. The system which would train men only as machines for state service, the raw material of capital, the national stock-in-trade of labour, or turn their education into a bare preventive police for crime, is a cruel mockery on the true rights of conscience, a fraud on their immortal hopes, and an insult to their Maker. And whoever, under the name of secular education, would wrest or turn aside any part from this high purpose, which ought to consecrate the whole, so far despoils religion of its just supremacy, and commits robbery against the souls of his fellow men.

However various the departments of education, this noble character, a training for immortality, belongs in common to all. It is the last harbour to be reached that determines the course of the vessel, though other ports may have to be touched at by the way. And thus, too, each season of life ought to prepare for that which follows; every rank and profession may require its distinct and peculiar training, but the pole star in every case must be the hope of the life to come. Whatever forsakes this grand object, is not education—it is a delusion of darkness. The teaching which is mute upon man's immortality, is no light from heaven to cheer and to bless, but an *ignis fatuus* to destroy.

National Education, in this its true sense, has been one great purpose of God's Providence since the world began. The rain and the sunshine, the stars of heaven, and the flowerets of earth, are parts of one vast economy, which all centres in the instruction of the sojourners of mankind, to prepare them for the searching scrutiny through which they must pass, and that blessed home to which they ought to aspire. The Family and the State have, from the first, been two chief agents employed by Providence in this noble work. But, when the darkness of idolatry and sensual lust had corrupted both, and perverted them from their true aim, the Son of God himself appeared as the great Prophet and Teacher of a fallen world. Founding his Church immovably on the rock of his own promise, he sent her forth as a fresh agent in this work of mercy, and gave her a large commission to teach all nations and families to the end of time, and to train them in the pathway of life eternal.

There is, indeed, a spurious counterfeit, which in every age has sought to usurp the name of education, while flatly opposed to its true object. It may fitly be called "*Secular Education*,"

a training for this world alone, without caring for the next. It is made up of half truths, perverted into falsehood—of earthly facts divorced from moral truth and religious obedience—and of a pandering to a corrupt appetite for unseasonable knowledge. By these characters was it marked when it began in Paradise, and these serpent-features it has retained ever since. “Your eyes shall be opened”—there was a partial truth in the words. But the truth served only to bait the delusion, and do the work of falsehood. “Ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil;” here was intellectual progress set at variance with the will and command of God. And what were the natural effects? Misery and death! Such was secular education at its birth—and such, in its main features, it still continues. May our country never fall into the fatal snare! May she never believe the syren voice which tells her that “the sole effectual means of preventing the tremendous evils of anarchy, is by giving the working people a good secular education!” (pp. 44.) May she never accept these apples of Sodom in exchange for the living truth of God’s holy word!

But as some may question the sufficiency of the view just given of Christian education, we will shortly test its truth, as applied to one or two classes. Let us take, first, the Christian child. Is there any part of his education, when rightly conducted, which stretches beyond the definition—a training for immortality? The simplest division, perhaps, is domestic training, preparation for future employment, and instruction purely religious. Now what is the domestic training of a child but one lesson of obedience to those great commands—“Honour thy father and thy mother”—“Love one another as brethren?” And what motive so powerful for this end as the sense of God’s authority and the consciousness of his presence? And what is its true purpose, its guiding aim? Surely it is the culture, in the infant mind, of whatever is pure, lovely, and of good report, as a preparation for the pure society and unfading joys of heaven. What, again, is the preparation for the future engagements of life, but a training in heavenward lessons of diligence and obedience on a larger scale, and an awakening of the soul to hopes which are never to be satisfied but in the fruition of the life to come? In short, the whole education of a child is contained in those elements of which the Church Catechism is the brief summary. It is an implanting of the unseen truths of faith, an instilling of lessons of duty and habits of obedience, with the awakening of spiritual desires and aspirations; but all these based on a covenant re-

lation to the common Lord, and sustained by the blessed hope of an heavenly inheritance.

To the education of the operative and tradesman the same remarks will apply. Even so far as its object is to provide for present wants, it is the importance of life, as the short season of probation, which forms the true key-note of the whole. It is the day of rest which humanizes and dignifies the six days of labour. Profane the labourer's sabbath, and you turn his tasks into an unmeaning drudgery; and then, in spite of every political expedient, his spirit will quickly sour down into dark and sullen rebellion. A provision for bodily wants, however, is a meagre and barren view of these engagements: their main design is, to be a discipline of contentment and self-denial to the poor, of generous bounty to the rich, and of justice and equity to all. If this be now too much forgotten, one reason is that modern economists have given the lie to the Son of God, and taught that a man's life *does* consist in the abundance of his possessions. The natural effects of such teaching are only too visible around us: murmuring rebellion in the poor; hard-hearted, cold indifference in the rich; fraud and persecution in every branch of trade, and the pillars of the social edifice crumbling into ruin. Such are and ever will be the fruits, when our labourers and artisans are left untrained, or trained for this world only. Such an education poisons the life-blood of the State. Society then sickens fast and dies: the rich will have their hearts frozen by icy theories of men; and demagogues will goad the poorer classes into frenzy and madness.

It would lead us too far to trace the same truth through every class, and in each department of instruction. We could delight to expatiate on a theme so noble and yet so various; but a word must suffice. Whether we consider the liberal education of the Christian gentleman, or the training into healthy allegiance of the intelligent Churchman; whether we trace the research of the natural philosopher, the wisdom of the statesman, or the learning of the divine, true education has the same grand features in every case. It is a present discipline of the soul, by the knowledge of nature, of man, and of God, quickened and inspired by the living hope of eternity, and with the future possession of an immortal inheritance for its final aim.

But we must return to the Government pamphlet. And we cannot but repeat, with grief and pain, that upon this truth, the corner-stone of the whole subject, it maintains a deep and ominous silence. Through these ninety pages education seems

viewed as a State expedient, for drilling the lower classes into order, or a means of repressing anarchy and checking the grosser forms of crime. How deplorable that the rulers of a Christian state should content themselves with so narrow and contracted a view! There must be deep ignorance of the true bearing of the subject, when, in a professed vindication of their measures, the central truth of the whole is passed by in utter silence.

The pamphlet, however, shall explain for itself the views of its authors upon the nature of Education. The three following passages are, perhaps, the most express. First, at the opening:—

“All the plans which have been proposed for promoting National Education in England, by calling into operation the powers of the Executive Government, have necessarily been subjected to the most searching scrutiny. The advocates of education must not, however, accept the earnestness with which public attention is directed to this subject, as a measure of the degree in which the necessity of an extension and improvement of the elementary education of the poorer classes is recognised. It is, indeed, generally known, that even the art of reading has been acquired only by a portion of the rising population, and a smaller part of the adult working classes; and that, as respects the rudimentary knowledge which might develop the understanding, and afford the labourer a clear view of his own social position, its duties, difficulties, and rewards, and thus enable him better to employ the powers with which Providence has gifted him, to promote his own comfort and the well-being of society, he is generally destitute, and, what is worse, abandoned to the ill-regulated, and often pernicious agencies by which he is surrounded. It is commonly confessed, that no sufficient means exist to train the habits of the children of the poorer classes—to inspire them with healthful, social, and household sympathies—with a love of domestic peace and order—with an enlightened reverence for revealed truth—and with the sentiment of piety and devotion.”

Again, in page 18—

“In the concentrated population of our towns, the dangers arising from the neglect of the intellectual and moral culture of the working class are already imminent; and the consequences of permitting another generation to rise, without bending the powers of the Executive Government and of society to the great work of civilization and of religion, for which the political and social events of every hour make a continual demand, must be social disquiet little short of revolution. But the same masses of population are equally open to all the beneficial influences derivable from a careful cultivation of their domestic and social habits; from the communication of knowledge enabling them to perceive their true relation to the other classes of society, and how dependent their interests are upon the stability of our institutions and the preservation of social order.”

And still more plainly, page 43—

“The Chartists think that it is in the power of Government to raise the rate of wages by interfering between the employer and the workman; they imagine that this can be accomplished by a maximum of prices and a minimum of wages, or some similar contrivance; and a considerable portion of them believe that the burden of taxation and of all “fixed charges” (to use Mr. Attwood’s expression), ought to be reduced by issuing inconvertible paper, and thus depreciating the currency. They are confident that a Parliament, chosen by universal suffrage, would be so completely under the dominion of the working classes, as to carry these measures into effect; therefore they petition for universal suffrage, treating all truly remedial measures as unworthy of their notice, or as obstacles to the attainment of the only objects really important. Now the sole effectual means of preventing the tremendous evils with which the anarchical spirit of the manufacturing population threatens the country, is by giving the working people a good secular education, to enable them to understand the true causes which determine their physical condition, and regulate the distribution of wealth among the several classes of society. Sufficient intelligence and information to appreciate these causes might be diffused by an education which could easily be brought within the reach of the entire population, though it would necessarily comprehend more than the mere rudiments of instrumental knowledge.

“We are far from being alarmists; we write neither under the influence of undue fear, nor with a wish to inspire undue fear in others. The opinions we have expressed are founded on a careful observation of the proceedings and speeches of the Chartists, and of their predecessors in agitation in the manufacturing districts for many years, as reported in their newspapers; and have been as deliberately formed as they are deliberately expressed.”

Now, in the first of these passages, we have, it is true, a vague mention of “reverence for revealed truth,” and “a sentiment of piety and devotion.” But this means everything or nothing, according to the prevailing tone of the writer. There is a ‘reverence’ for revealed truth, which shows itself by politely keeping it at a distance, as far too sacred to mingle with the affairs of life. In this ‘reverence,’ we suppose, one of the Committee of Council said, if we remember, in his place in Parliament, that the more religion governed our hearts, and the less it guided our hands, the better. There is a ‘sentiment also, of devotion,’ which, in its dreamy vagueness, has a most bitter contempt for Christian faith or sound doctrine. And such a sentiment may be here intended, from the plain approval with which the following extract of evidence is quoted:—

“Do you not suppose that a sufficient religious education could be conveyed without the conveyance, at the same time, of any peculiar religious doctrine?—I am disposed to think so, as regards children,

because I think that the doctrines of our religion, as far as they have a tendency to influence the habits and practice of the young, may be separated and kept distinct from the peculiar opinions of any one sect.'

"Has it ever suggested itself to you, in the matter of teaching religion, that teaching theology is one thing, and inculcating religious habits is another?—Yes, I think that is obvious, though certainly not sufficiently attended to in practice.

"In the creation of religious habits, do not all sorts of Christians agree, as far as you have had an opportunity of considering the subject of teaching?—I think so.

"Supposing that we wanted to teach theology to pupils, the teaching of theology would be like the teaching of any other science?—It certainly requires a matured understanding to deal with subjects so deep and difficult; nor can it be very profitable employment for the mind of a child, to be turned to points of doctrine, upon which, from its very nature, it cannot be informed.'

But if the first passage were doubtful in its meaning, the doubt is removed by comparing it with the others. There we learn that the main end of the State Education is the "communication of knowledge to the manufacturing poor, enabling them to see their relation to the other classes, and how dependent their interests are on the stability of our institutions, and the preservation of social order." We learn further, that "the only remedy for the anarchical spirit that threatens the country is by giving the working people a good secular education." We learn also "that these opinions have been as deliberately formed as they are deliberately expressed." When further we observe, that in the Model School religious dogmas were to be carefully parted off from the general instruction, who can help seeing that this 'reverence for revealed truth,' this 'sentiment of piety and devotion,' is an elegant and tasteful garnish to please the eye, and that secular education is the beginning and ending, the sum and substance of the whole scheme?

We must pause a moment upon this deliberately expressed doctrine of our present Executive. A 'good secular education' the sole remedy for the anarchical spirit of the day! A knowledge of the laws which 'regulate the distribution of wealth' the only cure for Chartism and disaffection! Those evil and unruly passions which have scoffed away the fear of God's judgments, and trampled on the hopes of the Gospel, will yield, it seems, to the mighty charm of dissertations on the laws of capital and theorems on the level of wages. The stubborn and frantic spirit of democratic lawlessness, that refuses to be bound with the chains of Divine authority, will consent to be caught in the meshes of fine-spun theories of trade, and to be bound with the cobwebs of a selfish

economy! There is no supernatural power, we have been told, on which we can rely. So that our only resource lies in circulating "the Wealth of Nations," or more attractive novels of the same school, dressed up by some lady politician for the popular taste. Surely those who obtrude such monstrous views on the public cannot be aware of the affront which they are offering to the moral power and transforming energy of the Christian revelation. Who but an atheist, or a madman, can look to human theories of profit and loss for effectual aid, where the ordinances of the Church of Christ, and the immortal hopes of the Gospel, have been trampled under foot and been cast away?

Having compared the Christian view of education with those which appear prominent in the pamphlet, we may next consider the courses open for the State to pursue upon this subject, and compare them with the actual course of our present Government. There seem to us *four* possible alternatives within the choice of a nominally Christian State.

The first of these is, when the rulers of the State conscientiously submit to the faith of Christ, and cordially enrol themselves as members of his visible Church. It supposes them to feel and profess a deep conviction of the great truths of the Gospel, and of their vital importance to the national welfare. It supposes, further, that they recognize the appointment by Christ of visible ordinances, which all his disciples, whether kings or subjects, are bound to obey; and through which the great purposes of His divine mission can most effectually be realized throughout the land. They will act then, cheerfully and with earnestness, upon these convictions. Thankful for the Divine gift, they will throw their talents, their influence, and their authority, into the scale of truth, which they will know, with full assurance, to be the scale also of national peace and social happiness. If the Constitution have limited their power within narrow bounds—if they need to wait for the consent of the people, and their people disown the principles which they themselves reverence, if just and lawful measures of moral suasion are used in vain—then, rather than sell their conscience, they will sacrifice their power, and nobly resign a trust which they can no longer hold without doing violence to their own convictions, and betraying the highest interests of the State. Such men,—and such, like Gustavus Vasa, whom the authors of the pamphlet might have blushed to name, there have been in former times, though perhaps they now form an extinct species—such men, we say, will doubtless be twitted by the place-hunters of the day as "unfit for the government of men in the nineteenth century." But they would have their reward in the testimony of their con-

science, the favour of good men, and the high approval of God. And perhaps in the hour of danger they might be recalled, like the hero of Greece or the judge of Israel, with tenfold honour, by the very parties who had before driven them from the helm.

The second course that a Christian Executive might adopt is one, perhaps, less liable to be thought Utopian by modern statesmen, since it would demand less of self-sacrifice, and would imply less maturity of discernment in sacred things. We may suppose rulers, as before, deeply convinced of the Divine truth and social power of the Christian faith in its grand outlines, but distracted by the rents and divisions of the Church, and lax in their view of its ordinances and visible form. They might still, in this case, adopt a course, lower indeed in its tone than the former, and more perplexed in its working, but still fraught with a large blessing, when compared to one of blind religious indifference. They might begin with laying down the great doctrinal truths of our faith as the basis of their plan, the guide of their efforts, and the standard of the instruction they seek to diffuse. They might then extend their aid, by funds or otherwise, to all schools or societies for national instruction which pledge themselves to those great principles. They might even dispense that aid in various degrees, according to the stability, constitutional weight, or practical efficiency of the schools or societies which required it. And having thus given a pledge themselves of the nature and honesty of their Christian profession, and their sincere desire for the religious training of the people, they might fairly claim to the same extent, and no further, the right of inspection, to ensure that the funds advanced by the State are honestly applied to the intended purpose. Such a plan is doubtless inferior in dignity of principle, in practical simplicity, and final efficiency, to the one first named. But still it is consistent in itself, and something easier in its immediate application to a State split into parties, and a Church surrounded with sects or rent with divisions. And perhaps the degree of Christian knowledge which it requires exceeds, rather than falls short of, what is now to be found commonly among our statesmen.

The third course possible, if course it may be called, is that of total, or nearly total inaction. We may conceive the case of rulers who feel deeply the wants of the country, the loud call for more wide-spread national instruction and the vital importance of a sound education diffused through the land. But they see also the need of a religious basis to the whole. They see the necessity, for this end, of sound doctrine, of effective discipline, and of a Divine authority as the sanction of both. Their own faith however is dim and feeble. They can scarce decide for them-

selves, among contending creeds, much less can they decide so clearly as to take the responsible task of diffusing any among their people. To choose amidst the varieties of discipline they find still more hopeless. They have indeed a twilight "reverence for revealed truth," but it is too dim to guide their steps in any practical measures. They have "a sentiment of piety and devotion," but it is far too thin and airy to bear them firmly along through the strife of parties, and the clash of opposing interests. One virtue, however, at least, they still retain. They have the sense to feel their weakness, and the frankness to confess it, and the honesty to follow out the confession. They still own what none can deny, without the most glaring folly, that all education, to be real, must be religious; and upon religious questions they feel themselves unfit to decide. They take, therefore, modestly and quietly, the lower place, to which their religious ignorance consigns them. They leave the cause of Education, with outward facilities and their good wishes only, to those who possess the faith, zeal, and knowledge to mould it by Christian truth, and to direct it steadily to its great and holy aim. For themselves, they will be content to act as the head police and moral scavengers of the State; to preserve its outward order, sustain the rights of property, and clear it from more open and flagrant crimes. It would be melancholy that rulers, once Christian, should ever fall so low; more melancholy still, if Christians, self-called spiritual, should be found to cheer them on in the downward road of apostacy, and laud their base desertion of their true office as the glorious and perfect ideal of a Christian state. But while, in such a case, we must grieve at their fall, and pity the ignorant rashness of their spiritual advisers, we could at least commend their wisdom in confessing their shame, and renouncing all pretences of fulfilling that office of National Education for which they must know, in their own conscience, that they were utterly and hopelessly disqualified.

There is only one other course which seems to us possible for an Executive to adopt. It is when the civil rulers of a state, as a body, profess no special religion, adopt no special creed, adhere specially to no visible Church, but float in a vague and willing uncertainty; and with the question of Pilate in their hearts, and even in their mouths, embrace all doctrines, true or false, with a strictly impartial patronage. It is just conceivable that such statesmen, while devoid of any corporate religious profession, and virtually renouncing all conviction in matters of faith, may still claim to be patrons of education, and undertake to superintend its spread among a Christian people. We may conceive them to support, without distinction, every mode of faith, to

supply funds to every sect, to arrange for the instruction of the people in every existing creed ; and, on the ground of this pecuniary support, to claim the right of inspection, and the controul which that inspection implies, over the visible Church, and every Christian communion, orthodox or heretical, within their dominions. What shall we say of such a Government, and of such a system ? We will assert boldly, in the sight of God and men, that it bears on its very face the broad stamp of its own folly and guilt ; that in theory it is a contradiction—in practice, a labyrinth without a clue ; that it is dishonest in its pretensions, tyrannical in its plain tendency, and earthly and infidel to its very heart's core.

Let us now examine the actual course of our present Government, that we may discover to which of these it must be referred, and be able to judge what are its claims to our confidence, and to the co-operation of our Church and its rulers.

The first feature which must strike every one in these Recent Measures of our Government, is the manner in which the whole subject is brought before the public. The Education of a Christian country, almost the very highest of all moral and religious questions which a Legislature could entertain, comes to be discussed and decided in the shape of a Money Bill ! If the object were to justify Napoleon's sarcasm, that the English are a nation of shopkeepers, we know not what more effectual course could have been taken. Instead of being ushered in as its importance demands, and based on a distinct, clearly-defined, and solemnly-expressed enactment, which might embody the deliberate judgment of the whole Legislature, the measure is thrust in among the crowd of estimates, and viewed merely as a small item in our annual expenditure. The vote for Education, as treated by our Executive, differs in nothing from the vote for the stables at Windsor, except in being of less than half the amount. The training of horses for the Royal hunt, and the "good secular education" of the people for State service, is thus placed on the same level by the Ministers of the Crown. This is the first pledge they offer to the public of the large and noble views which are to preside in the plans of Government. And when we remember that the professed design of this course is to lay the foundation of a new and complete system of State Education, surely no step could have been better contrived to fix the stamp of an incurable and narrow earthly-mindedness upon the whole project.

The next feature of these Recent Measures is the natural consequence of the last. The functions of the combined Legislature are superseded by the Lower House, and a vote of the

Commons puts the constitution in abeyance. On a subject the most vital to the permanent interests of the country, and involving the welfare of future generations, that House, which embodies our ancestral dignity and the permanence of our national life, is without ceremony set aside. This is a strain on the constitution, which no special pleading can justify. If it be urged, in excuse, that the motive was an earnest desire for immediate steps to meet a pressing evil, and that the difficulties could not be otherwise surmounted, the answer to such excuses is plain. No national measures, on so vital a subject, can ever work healthily or happily for the good of the people, unless there be first a general concurrence in their favour in the supreme legislature. Without this, they will only breed endless dissension, and multiply causes of irritation and strife. They cease, in fact, to be national, and become the measures of a mere party. They will act on the State by convulsive starts and spasms, instead of the quiet, vigorous power of a fixed, integral element of the national life. This ingenious stratagem, by which the constitution is destroyed, under the cover of its own forms—this new invention of state to depose the House of Peers by tacking a balance-sheet to every high matter of legislation, and turning the education of millions of immortal souls into a question of ways and means, and merchandize—this, we say, is the pledge we must accept from our Government, of the moral honesty, the high, manly, Christian tone which is to animate the new system of State Education.

The third feature to be noticed is the constitution and powers of the new Committee of Council. We will transcribe the words of the appointment, with the remarks of the pamphleteer :—

“ ‘Some of these defects appear to admit of an immediate remedy, and I am directed by Her Majesty to desire, in the first place, that your Lordship, with four other of the Queen’s servants, should form a Board, or Committee, for the consideration of all matters affecting the Education of the People.

“ ‘For the present it is thought advisable that this Board should consist of,—

The Lord President of the Council.

The Lord Privy Seal.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department, and

The Master of the Mint.

“ ‘It is proposed that the Board should be entrusted with the application of any sums which may be voted by Parliament, for the purposes of Education in England and Wales.’

“ ‘A Committee of Council on Education was accordingly appointed on the 10th April, 1839—and it should be observed that the functions of

the Committee are limited to 'superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting public Education.' These functions are therefore precisely similar to those which were exercised by the Treasury in the years 1835, 6, 7, and 8.

"The Committee of Council is equally amenable to Parliament, annually, for all its proceedings: the sum confided to it is not greater than that entrusted to the Treasury. As it consists of five responsible Members of the Cabinet, instead of only one, the security for correct administration is augmented, and its proceedings are, in all respects, rendered more open to observation, by their separation from the mass of details with which the Treasury is encumbered, and their transference to a department where they can obtain more constant and deliberate attention from the Executive. In all these respects the change is a great improvement, though it appears to have been the source of much groundless alarm."

Now here it is plain that the Government writer skilfully evades the real grounds of the alarm which the Christian public must feel. It is neither the number of the Committee, nor the present amount of the funds entrusted to them, which awakens this fear. The alarm arises from the undefined nature of the powers of this Committee, and the spirit which too plainly guides them. When the funds were applied only to the National, or even the British Society, there was a tolerable pledge for their right and safe application. But now we learn from the Minute of June 3rd, "The Committee do not feel themselves precluded from making grants in particular cases, *which shall appear to them to call for the aid of Government*, although the applications may not come from either of the two mentioned societies." The sole rule is, *what shall appear fitting* to the Lords of the Committee. The door, then, is left wide open: they have only to frame such conditions of their grants, as either or both of those societies cannot in conscience receive, and the whole sum is at their ultimate disposal, to bestow in any direction, upon any sect, to the patronage of any falsehood, after their own mere will and pleasure.

But the chief cause of alarm is the nature of those views of education which the Committee too plainly adopt, and the secret and evil influence that controls them. We need go no further than the pamphlet for evidence of their views. Those who deliberately profess that, "the only remedy for the anarchical spirit is a good secular education, and a knowledge of the laws which regulate the distribution of wealth," will be sure, in their practical measures, to thrust revealed religion into some corner of "special" instruction, and to cast the minds of those whom they educate in an earthly and secular mould. And when the smallness of the sum is pleaded, we must remember, that if the

principle be once affirmed, there is no pledge against any increase whatever in the amount. This was forcibly put by Lord Ashley in the course of the debate. "The Committee are to determine the principle, mode, and measure of distribution; to introduce new systems of education, say what is to be taught and what to be withheld; to define limits of doctrine, and declare what is common to all, and what must be considered as special to a few. They have power also to enact rules, a submission to which is a necessary preliminary to aid from the public fund. What enormous powers to confer upon any body of men! and what a precedent for future Governments to follow! We are called on this year to vote only £30,000; another year we may be called upon for a million: and this for the purpose of acquiring dominion over the whole mind of the country!—Suppose that the Churchmen and the Wesleyans are unable to accede to the conditions proposed by the new Board; what will be the result? Why, that the whole sum will be left at the disposal of the Privy Council; first, to promote dissent, and to bring up children in hostility to the Established Church; and secondly, for the foundation of schools, not to teach the doctrines of the Church—those doctrines in which ourselves and the Wesleyans concur—but to teach any, and what, faith they please: the Roman Catholic faith, the Socinian faith, or no faith at all, or the party-coloured, pie-bald faith, patronized and published by the Central Society."

From the second Minute, however, and its arbitrary powers, we must recur to the first, which forms the most sure and equitable guide to the spirit in which the other will be carried out. It is true that Minute is now, in words, rescinded,—nipped in the bud, alas, by the cruel bigotry of those who fancy "the orthodox faith" to be something better than "their own private opinions," and who are so antiquated, as even to imagine that it has some connexion with "the demonstrable temporal happiness of millions!" But still, even in death, it is lovely in the eyes of the Committee, and calls forth many a lingering look of their paternal affection. The last chapter of the pamphlet is therefore fitly devoted to its special vindication. We copy the Minute entire (page 68):—

"Religious instruction to be considered as general and special.

"Religion to be combined with the whole matter of instruction, and to regulate the entire system of discipline.

"Periods to be set apart for such peculiar doctrinal instruction as might be required for the religious training of the children.

"To appoint a chaplain to conduct the religious instruction of children whose parents or guardians belong to the Established Church.

"The parent or natural guardian of any other child to be permitted to secure the attendance of the licensed minister of his own persuasion, at the period appointed for special religious instruction, in order to give such instruction apart.

"To appoint a licensed minister to give such special religious instruction, wherever the number of children in attendance on the Model School belonging to any religious body dissenting from the Established Church, is such as to appear to this Committee to require such special provision.

"A portion of every day to be devoted to the reading of the Scriptures in the school, under the general direction of the Committee, and superintendence of the Rector. Roman Catholics, if their parents or guardians require it, to read their own version of the Scriptures, either at the time fixed for reading the Scriptures, or at the hours of special instruction."

First of all, religion, in this Normal or Model School of the Government, is to be divided into general and special. The pamphlet tells us, indeed, that "it was not the intention of the Committee to propose these regulations for other schools." If so, this Normal or Model School, in its most striking and most essential feature, was designed as a beacon for others to avoid, rather than a pattern for them to follow. This requires no small measure of faith to believe. Why, then, in the second Minute, do the Lords of the Council speak of "grants, now or hereafter, for the establishment and support of *Normal Schools*?" Does this look as if there were intended to be one only? Why the imposing title of "The Model School," if its main feature was never to be copied? Why all the formal instructions of the Minute? What reason can be found, why the plan preferred by the State for the training of teachers, should not be equally preferred in the training of scholars, wherever the Committee can choose the method for themselves? Why does the Home Secretary, in the words of the Committee's first appointment, assign as one main reason, "the want of a *Model School*, which may serve for the example of those Societies and Committees which anxiously seek to improve their own methods of teaching?" The statement in the pamphlet, that the Model School was never meant to be imitated in this main feature, can scarcely, then, be acquitted of direct and wilful collusion.

But what is this general religion of which the Minute speaks? There is an attempt, in the pamphlet, more skilful than honest, to give the impression, that it is the same with the nine truths which form the basis in the Martinière regulations of the Bishop of Calcutta. We could wish that even this comparative soundness belonged to it. We pass by the Bishop's own vindication from the peculiar circumstances of that endowment, and the practical uncertainty that still hangs over the experiment. It is

enough for us to shew, from the pamphlet itself, that except the words "general" and "special," there is nothing else in common in the two plans. For, let us examine the Minute itself: the third, fifth, and sixth regulations shew, that all is regarded as "special," which embodies "peculiar doctrinal instruction," or the differences of sentiment in any "religious persuasion," of any "religious body dissenting from the Church." The general religion must, therefore, be the residuum, when all these are taken away. It would be plainly absurd to refer the same doctrine, to the special and the general branch. To gain more precise views, then, of this general religion, we must learn what sects or bodies are included in the arrangement. And here the pamphlet assists us:—

"But when to the rights recognized by the law the Dissenters have superadded the claim arising out of the exertions they have spontaneously made to provide for education, in some of the most important districts of the country, we are at a loss to know, on what pretence they can be excluded from sharing the secular benefits of any provision for National Education furnished at the public cost, or how the Government could have been justified, either in formally excluding them from the privilege of educating their teachers in the Normal school, or (which is equivalent to that), in imposing such religious observances on those teachers, or so inadequately providing for their entire religious freedom, as practically to have occasioned their exclusion.

"Nothing would tend so much to increase the political power of religious denominations not agreeing with the Established Church, as to attempt a partial or exclusive distribution of any new civil advantages, after admitting them to a theoretical equality of civil rights. We believe it to be impossible to place on the statute-book any such law; but once there, the clamour would be so loud and fierce, that any Administration must quail before it, and if Parliament did not listen to the indignant remonstrances of the constituency, this would become the sole topic of electioneering agitation until the new enactment was repealed.

"Conceiving the application of the public funds to the exclusive secular advantage of any class of religionists impossible, we are of opinion that two courses only were open to the Committee of Privy Council, in proposing the plan of a Normal School.

"1. To establish separate Normal Schools for different classes of religionists.

"2. To establish a Normal School open to all."

The religious bodies to be included, thus extend as far as the actual existence of schools, on the one hand, or the "theoretic equality of civil rights" on the other; and no "partial or exclusive" view is to narrow the list. They comprise, therefore, Churchmen, Wesleyans, Orthodox Dissenters, and Friends; Romanists, Socinians, and Jews. When a 'more impartial dis-

tribution of civil advantages' shall have repealed the exclusive laws against blasphemy, the Socialists must, of course, be added to the others. The general religion will be that in which all these parties agree; that is, simply nothing. The special religious instruction will be all in which they differ; that is, every truth of Christianity, and even of natural, as well as revealed religion. Such, as deduced from the statements of its own promoters, is the natural working, the only consistent consummation, of the Government scheme.

Where such is the foundation of the building, it would be useless labour to spend our time in tracing the architectural details. We grow weary and sick at heart, in examining a system, where state expediency is everything, and the immortal hopes of mankind a mere feather in the scale; a moral chaos, where truth is to be blended with every shape of falsehood, and no spirit of life is to be seen brooding over the waters. But there are some views of our Executive, brought forward in this manifesto, which call for a brief notice, from the light which they throw upon the main subject.

And first, we observe, with shame and sorrow, that in this vindication put forth by the Ministry of their views and plans on Education, the only distinct mention of the word of God occurs in a highly-coloured picture of its frequent and dangerous perversion. Now, we are well aware of the painful truth, that such perversions do too often occur. The sacred writers themselves give warning of this solemn fact in the strongest terms. But we ask, is it right, or fitting, or consistent with due reverence for God's word, that this should be the only light in which our rulers here present it to the nation? It is strange that the facts which they adduce did not teach them a different lesson. "To such purposes," they say, "may the Scriptures be wrested by unscrupulous men, who have practised on the ignorance, discontent, and suffering, of the mass. Their power will continue as long as the people are without sufficient intelligence to discern in what the fearful error of such impiety consists." But the Lords of the Council might have known, that it is not merely want of intelligence that causes these wretched perversions. It is far more the want of deep reverence for the Divine Word, and a false notion of obscurity and uncertainty in its meaning, spread through the minds of the people. And who are more chargeable with a share in both offences than the authors of a scheme, where all creeds are jumbled side by side, and the publishers of a laboured defence, where nothing is mentioned of the Word of God, but its worst and vilest perversion? The Lord of heaven and of earth has been speaking to the sons of men, through four thousand years,

to guide their souls in the way of peace and salvation ; and yet the Lords of the Council, in a professed vindication of measures, which ought to have this for their only aim, make no mention of His holy oracles, unless to point them out as possible sources of delusion, or the pretexts for rebellion and crime. The irreverence of such a course, which excites our indignation, is equalled by its littleness and childish folly.

We have noticed already the view taken in the pamphlet of "a good secular education," as the only and effectual cure for anarchy in the State. But its importance will justify a few further remarks. My Lords of the Council think that the Chartists are to be reclaimed by "understanding the laws which determine their physical condition, and regulate the distribution of wealth." In short, modern political economy is to be the grand specific. Adam Smith, Ricardo, and the novel writers who follow in their train, are the magicians who are to reclaim the disaffected, where the Church of Christ, and his Holy Gospel, have been tried and found wanting.

Now, for a moment, setting Christianity aside, we tell them that, on their own ground, and reasoning from their own earthly level of thought, they are miserably deceived. For ourselves, we have bestowed on those systems some patient thought ; we have no pressure of want to bias us, and certainly no democratic passion to warp our judgment ; and yet we are convinced, in common with thousands of thoughtful men, that the vitals of those theories are unsound, that they are based on selfishness, and in their results immoral, and anti-Christian. What madness, then, to think by such hollow theories, to still the cravings of pinching want, or to silence the clamours of the poor, or to calm the passions of excited millions ! The Chartists, my Lords, will laugh to scorn your fine-spun theories, in which moral duty finds no place. They will tell you, and tell you with truth, that the question is not how wealth is, but how it ought to be, distributed ? They know well enough, they will say, by bitter experience, that the selfishness of capital, left to itself, tends to massive wealth on the one hand and grinding poverty on the other. Nor can you make any consistent reply to their reproaches, till you have made this life subordinate to the life to come ; and melted down the facts which you have mixed with the dross of your selfish theories, to recast them in the mould of moral duty and Christian truth. If you will not learn that true political wisdom consists in applying legal and moral correctives to the tendencies of trade, not in leaving them to their own downward course ; if you will persist yourselves to build your theories of economy on a basis of cold self-interest ; then it is idiocy in you to com-

plain when the Chartists work out, consistently, your own grand principle, and in the hope of immediate gain, convulse society to its roots, and scatter the rights of property to the winds.

There is another favourite notion of some modern liberals, which peeps out here and there in this pamphlet, and shews the loose texture of the religious faith of the compilers. It is the view of religion as a matter of taste and convenience, which may shift and vary with the spirit of the age or country. Thus we are told (p. 20) that the Scotch system of religious education, "though with numerous imperfections, is in many respects, adapted to the genius of their nation." So, again, we are told, that when Gustavus Vasa, in Sweden, diffused the Lutheran doctrine over the whole country, "this change in the religious institutions of the country harmonized with the wants and character of the people of that age." Following out this sage maxim, it will appear, with the same clear evidence, that Christianity "harmonized" with the wants and character of the first century, Popery and Mahometanism with those of the sixth and seventh, Protestantism with the sixteenth; and, perhaps, therefore, the nineteenth may require some deep tinge of liberal infidelity to "harmonize with the character and genius" of the people of this age.

We do not deny that there is a deep and solemn meaning which may be extracted out of such statements. It is true, on the one hand, that God prepares the soil for every revival of his holy truth; and on the other, that his Providence never suffers any delusion to have free scope and course, till the secret perverseness of man has paved the way for the righteous visitation. But the natural tendency of the expressions is, to insinuate a most dangerous falsehood. They bring down religion from its high aspect of eternal truth, and place it on the footing of a mere popular taste, like the amusements of the theatre, or varieties of national costume.

But we must draw these remarks to a close. The conclusion from the whole strikes us as very plain and simple. The present Government, and the liberal majority of the Commons who approve their scheme, are, in the only just and Christian view of sound education, uneducated themselves. Judging them by the fairest evidence—their plans, their speeches, and the pamphlet put forth in their defence—they have no lively sense of man's immortality, no deep reverence for the Word of God, no fixed views of Christian doctrine, and the mighty energy of its motives. And from all these causes combined, they are ignorant of the very aim and purpose of all true education, and utterly unfit, therefore, to preside over its course, or to control

its operations. With their present standard of faith and laxness of profession, we may apply to them the words of the Prophet, "their strength is to sit still." The best thing they can do at present, in the matter of Education, is to do no mischief. While their views remain such as are here deliberately expressed, the Church of God, in the training of her members, must reject the intrusion of their control as an alien and adverse influence. How, indeed, should those who put selfish theories of economy on a level with Divine truth be fit to guide the instruction of a Christian people? How should those whose hearts have been chilled down by the icy selfishness of trade, till they coolly vote that "it does not seem advisable to abandon so important a revenue" as one really derived from smuggling poison into a vast Empire, and who afterwards demand indemnity at the cannon's mouth, when the poisonous drug has been righteously destroyed,—how can such men dare to take upon themselves the moral training of the members of Christ and children of God! The bare attempt to do this, in the present state of our Commons' majority, seems little short of a direct insult on the Majesty of Heaven.

While however we protest from the heart, against State interference with Education, in its present form, we would be far from denying, nay, we would earnestly maintain the high office of Civil Rulers, once awake to their true dignity, and sufficiently qualified for its performance. Let our Government cast off the trammels of popish influence from without, and an infidel philosophy within, and return with hearty allegiance to God's living Word, and we will gladly own their authority—an authority co-ordinate with that of the rulers of the Church, in this great and holy work. We know how well it becomes their office, as the ministers of God for good, to lend the weight of their influence to this noble cause, and to assist in training the citizens of the State for citizenship with the Church triumphant, and the possession of a higher and unfading inheritance. We have no sympathy with the proud assertions of the desirableness of Ecclesiastical independence, whether their voice be heard in the noisy clamours of low railers against our Church, or in the fervid eloquence of her deceived, but sincere and conscientious opponents, or whether they reach us in devout and solemn whispers from her own cloistered retreats. The adversary of man, before his first temptation, has been finely described as circling the world in darkness,—

" Four times he crossed the car of night
From pole to pole, traversing each colure."

So too the spirit of delusion that is now compassing the ruin of

our Church, may be traced at the most distant poles of our Ecclesiastical universe. For ourselves, we abide cheerfully, and from deep conviction, by the statements of our formularies. We recognise, in Christian rulers, "that prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God himself, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and the evildoers." We long for no Acheloïdes to be cast up by the ocean, where priestly arrogance, like the genius of Arabian tale, unchecked by the seal of Solomon, the wise and righteous restraint of kingly power, might rear itself amidst the cloud of growing superstitions, into its own vast and gigantic dimensions. One grand experiment of this kind the Church has seen; but the lesson will never be lost upon her true children, and neither God nor man will suffer the portentous spectacle to be repeated again. No! the hopes which we cherish are of a different kind; the ideal after which we aspire beams, as we think, with a softer and yet a nobler beauty. We picture to ourselves a State, where the Prince and the Priest are joined in a covenant of peace, and rejoice in a common submission to the supreme authority of God's most blessed Word. We see the rulers of the State yielding a due reverence, far removed from the slavish prostration of the confessional, to the chief Pastors of the Lord's flock, and lending a glad and willing ear to their wholesome and godly admonitions. We see the Bishops and Overseers of Christ's Church submitting cheerfully to the powers ordained of God, and owning and honouring in the Civil Rulers the earthly delegates of Him whose title is Prince of the Kings of the Earth. We figure them bending their joint efforts to promote the welfare of the people intrusted to their charge, with a continual eye to His glory who has exalted them to their high office, and given them authority to discharge it in His name. We view them prospering in their great and holy work,—blasphemy repressed, anarchy quelled, disaffection shamed into silence, the truth encouraged and diffused, the ordinances of the Church honoured and observed, and a halo of sacred dignity encircling and enshrouding the favoured land. We see the education of the people, not treated with cold neglect, not a signal for the strife of faction, not viewed as an engine of Government police,—but undertaken in the fear of God, pursued in the light of His truth and by the guidance of His Holy Word: and while ensuring a thousand present fruits of social peace and union, yet never suffered for one moment to sink below its true aim and purpose.

the training of innumerable souls for a purer and higher state of unfading blessedness. We paint before our eyes, in all their hues of beauty, the effects of true religion spread through the land—a religion far removed from dreamy, lifeless, ascetic superstition, and further still from the earth-born theories and schemes of a coarse and vulgar expediency ;—a religion that would guide every thought and action to the good of its fellowmen, and yet hallow the meanest and commonest pursuits by a supreme regard to the glory of the Most High. Would that such a vision might soon be realised, and shame back into their native darkness those mists of superstitious fancy and liberal delusion, which are now threatening our Church and country on either hand. Then should we see National Education resume its true dignity and native grandeur. And while its noble fruits of peace, wisdom, and social union were blossoming and ripening on every side, surrounding nations would look on with wonder, and strive to copy the bright example ; the angels would renew over the favoured land that song of peace, with which they once greeted our Saviour's birth, and a blessed foretaste would be given to the nations here below of the glory which awaits the triumphant Church in the Paradise of God.

ART. III.—*A Practical Arrangement of Ecclesiastical Law.*

By FRANCIS N. ROGERS, Barrister-at-Law, Q. C. London. 1840. 1 vol. 8vo.

2. *Bacon's Abridgement of the Law—Title Simony.* Seventh edition. By Sir H. GWILLIM and CHARLES H. DODD. London. 1832.

3. *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani.* By EDMUND GIBSON, D.D. 2 vols. folio. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1767.

THE occurrence of the word "Simony" in the preamble of the statute passed in the 31st year of Elizabeth, and the definition of the common law crime of corrupt presentation, contained in the enacting clauses of that act, have led very many persons to suppose that this statute actually overruled the canonical law regarding that crime, abolished the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over it, and created a new offence under the old name, henceforth cognizable by the common law courts alone. Carrying out this view of the case, the same persons very naturally believe, that from the date of that enactment to the present time, no promise or contract for presentation ever has been or can be simoniacal, or contrary to the "Institution Oath," which is not provided for or defined by the Elizabethan statute ; and that consequently any clerical

person who has not committed such an offence as would subject him to an action under the provisions of that act, may safely take the "Institution Oath" against simoniacal contracts without any fear of perjuring himself. Such an opinion is not only contrary to the strict tenor of the present, and the clear language of former oaths, but to the received notions of the Church of England; of those of her prelates and dignitaries who have explored the mazes of ecclesiastical law, and of those judges of the common law who have been called upon to decide on cases of simoniacal contracts, brought before them under the provisions of the statute of Elizabeth.

An oath against simony, and all manner of corrupt presenting to ecclesiastical dignities, was, from the earliest times, strictly enjoined on our clergy, and fully set forth in the constitutions of our Church. In the decrees of the Council held at Westminster, in the year 1138, it was declared that every clerk, on his investiture, should swear, "*Se nihil propter hoc, vel per se, vel per aliquam aliam personam, dedisse alicui vel promisisse.*" Extensive as were the provisions of this oath, men were found wily enough to elude them; and, after a short period, the increase of the crime was so great as to compel the Council at Oxford, in the year 1222, to extend to bonds and contracts the provisions of the oath, and to decree that no clerk, who should resign his benefice to another, should receive the vicarage in return: "*Quia vehementer possit presumi, quod talia fiant per illicitam pactionem.*"*

It may seem strange that any one should choose to be a vicar rather than a rector; but as there might, in some particular cases, be other reasons for it, so there was one very apparent reason, namely, that the Lateran Council, under Innocent III., had forbidden the holding two churches, that is, two rectories, but not two vicarages, or a rectory and a vicarage. For though the Lateran Canon against pluralities was not yet put in execution here, yet the clergy were apprehensive that this would soon be done.

The crafty worldliness of patrons, and the ingenuity of lawyers, soon contrived new methods by which the gain might be to the patrons, and the loss to the Church. Benefices were granted as dowers, and annuities were secured to patrons out of the annual proceeds of the living. The former of these schemes was foiled by the decree of Richard Archbishop of Canterbury, in the fifteenth year of Henry III., which enacted that no one

* Promulgated by Stephanus Archbishop of Canterbury in the sixth year of Henry III. "*Inhibemus, ne quis Ecclesiæ suæ renuncians, a sibi substituto recipiat Vicariam ejusdem, cum vehementer, &c.*"

should henceforth present to any benefice or dignity—"nomine dotalitatis,"—or procure the presentation of a clerk for any kind of emolument whatever, under the penalty of perpetual deprivation of his patronage; although, for the sake of the Church's peace, the simoniacal incumbent was not to be ejected from his benefice.* The latter scheme was first discountenanced by the constitutions of St. Edmund Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1231, and finally abolished by the decree of Othobon, Cardinal Legate in the year 1268,† which declared all such reservation of pensions and annuities simoniacal, and from that time null and void, and enjoined an immediate revocation of all annuities. "Ecclesiis parochialibus hactenus impositas, nisi qui eas oblinent, aut percipiunt præscriptione legitima, vel speciali privilegio, aut a certo jure, ab initio sint muniti." It might have been supposed that the meshes of the canonical net had been now rendered impenetrable, and that the Church was at last preserved against the curse of simony. But, alas! though arrested in its progress, and almost abolished for a time, e'er a century had passed away, it put forth new leaves and flourished vigorously. To the great scandal of religion and prejudice of morality, many a good and learned man remained unbeneficed through poverty, and a door was opened to others by no means qualified to discharge the duties of the sacred calling. The daily increase of the crime compelled the Church to interfere once again, and in the year 1391 Archbishop Courteney, in his decree against "Choppe Churches," renewed the oath on institution, at that time fallen into disuse, and ordered that every clerk on his institution to any benefice should swear—

"Quod nec propter earum personarum præsentationem, nec dedit nec promissit, directe vel indirecte, per se, vel per submissas personas, aliquid præsentantibus, vel aliis personis quibuscunque. Quodque obligati

* Richard Archbp. of Cant. 15th Hen. III. "Nulli liceat ecclesiam nomine dotalitatis ad aliquem transferre, vel pro præsentatione alicujus personæ pecuniam, vel aliquod aliud emolumentum pacto interveniente recipere. Quod si quis fecerit, et in Jura convictus vel confessus fuerit, ipsum tam regia, quam nostrâ freti auctoritate, patronatu ejusdem Ecclesiæ in perpetuum privati satulmus."

† Spelman cites the Archbishop's Constitutions on this point, in these words: "Nos ut melius obviemus talibus morbis præsentantis ac præsentanti recipimus juramentum quod nec promissio nec pactio elicitâ intervenerit."

Othobon's decree was in these words:—"Quia plerumque evenire didicimus quod cum ad vacantem ecclesiam fuerit præsentatio faciendâ, is qui præsentandus est, prius cum patrono de certâ summâ de bonis ecclesiæ sibi annuatim solvenda paciscitur, et sic pactus ad ecclesiam præsentatur. Nos huic actui, tam simoniæ vitium quam ecclesiæ dispendium ingrenti, occurrere intendentes, universas promissiones et pactiones hujusmodi penitus revocamus, et eas in posterum fieri distinctius inhibemus, et si factæ fuerint, vires aliquas decernimus non habere;" and then goes on to revoke all other pensions, as in the text.

non sunt, nec eorum amici pro se juratoria vel pecuniaria cautione, de ipsis beneficiis resignandis vel permutandis, nec aliquid illicitum in ea parte contractum factum, vel promissum de ipsorum scientia ac voluntate sunt sortiti."

From the reign of Richard II. until that of Edward VI., we believe no further decrees were promulgated on this point by the authority of the Church. However, in the sixth year of the latter King's reign, the Institution Oath was finally settled and promulgated. Every kind of ecclesiastical preferment was included in its provisions under the word Sacerdotium, and every clerk according to it was to swear—

"Quod nec antea dedisse quicquam, nec postea daturum, aut de dando pactum intercessisse aut intercessurum, vel ipso auctore, vel alio quocunque procuratore aut vicario, respectu presentis sacerdotii, quod jam sumit; et si quis quam illum celans, hoc in genere quicquam molitus est, se quam primum novit, Episcopo renuntiaturum, et ejus arbitrio cessurum parte sacerdotio."

This was the last ecclesiastical decree, previous to the statute of Elizabeth.* Let us here pause to consider the much debated question of the jurisdiction of courts of common law over simoniacal contracts, previous to that statute.

Many persons, and amongst them the learned author of the Codex, have held that simony never was an offence at common law, and that the ecclesiastical courts alone had jurisdiction over simoniacal promises and contracts before the enacting of the Elizabethan statute.† Now, in answer to the first objection, we may state that some of our greatest common law judges, and amongst them Lord Coke and Chief Justice de Grey, have recorded their deliberate judgments, that although "eo nomine" simony was not an offence at common law, yet that all corrupt bargains for presentations to ecclesiastical dignities were cognizable by the courts of common law; that, being ever accompanied with perjury, it was detestable in the eye of that law; that

* *Reformatio Legum*. Section "de admittendis ad ecclesiastica beneficia, chap. 24 de forma juramenti ministrorum." We would recommend to all patrons a careful consideration of the 3d chap. in the same section: "Patronarum officium. Præterea patronis beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum præcipimus, ut omnibus seclusis, vel necessitudinum vel quorumcunque respectuum affectibus; illorum rationem habeant qui munus hoc sacrum, ad quod adhibendi sunt, possint et velint omnibus partibus implere. *Nec enim sacerdotia sunt delata ad Patronos, ut illa circumciderent, aut de illis deprædarentur, sed ut illorum præsidio, et fide tuto conquiscerent.*"

† The several authorities for these assertions are Coke's Institutes I. 80, I. 17, and III. 156. The cases of *Macadder v. Todderick*, Cro. Car. 363; *Winchcome v. Pulleston* Hob. 167; *Bartlett v. Vinor*, Carwithen 252; *Viner's Abridgement of the Law*;—Title Simony, and a case reported in the third vol. of *Phillimore's Ecclesiastical Reports*.

by the law of God and of the land it had always been accounted an high offence; and that previous to the statute of Westminster,* a plaintiff in quare impedit could not recover damages for the loss of his presentation, or such bonds be accounted valid, as they were made "ex turpi causa, et contra bonos mores," and against the law of the land, although not declared as such by the statutes. If then simony was an offence at common law, there can be little doubt of its having been punishable in the temporal courts; although it may be true in fact, that it was generally, if not always, proceeded against in the ecclesiastical.

"As the interest of religion," says Mr. Bacon, "is by this offence struck at in a more remarkable manner, this is not to be wondered at; and the less if it be considered that in times antecedent to the statute, spiritual courts did in some cases, wherein there was a concurrent jurisdiction, encroach upon, and in others entirely swallow up, the jurisdiction of the temporal."

Other authorities might be adduced, but these are sufficient to prove, that a corrupt bargain for presenting to a benefice was an offence at common law, and cognizable by the temporal courts concurrently with the spiritual. As neither the heinousness of the crime, or the provisions of the ecclesiastical law, was sufficient to put a stop to the offence, the special provisions of the statute law were called in to the assistance, but not the abolition, of the spiritual jurisdiction.

"For the avoiding simony and corruption in presentations, collations, and donations of and to benefices, dignities, prebends, and other livings and promotions ecclesiastical, and in admissions, institutions, and inductions to the same, (says the much questioned statute,) be it enacted that every person and bodies politic and corporate, who should be convicted of having presented a clerk to any ecclesiastical dignity, for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any grant, bond, promise, agreement, covenant, or other assurances," then that the presentation should be void, and the patron and his nominee, and any other person connected in the simoniacal contract, should forfeit double one year's value of the benefice, that value to be such as a jury would assess, and not such as might appear in the King's books.

By the same act all corrupt elections or resignations in colleges and hospitals were rendered void, and the turn restored either to the ordinary electors or such persons as it might vest in, according to the foundation under such circumstances. Amongst

* The Statute of "Westminster the second" was passed in the 13th year of Edward I.

all these extensive provisions and definitions, there was one clause too often overlooked, but of the greatest importance to the present authority of the ecclesiastical courts in this matter. By the ninth clause in this Act it was provided—

“That nothing in this act shall in any wise extend to take away or restrain any punishment, pain, or penalty, limited, prescribed, or instituted by the laws ecclesiastical, for any of the offences before in this act mentioned, but that the same shall remain in force and may be put in execution, as it might be before the execution of this act.”

From the presence of the word *simony* in the preamble of the act, and its absence in the enacting part of it, no more can be fairly inferred than that the intention and general design of the statute was to discourage simony, by laying new penalties on such branches of it as were specified in the enactments, and by giving a more expeditious remedy against these kinds than could be obtained through the spiritual courts; but in no way to limit the nature and extent of the crime, nor restrain or disturb the judges of those courts in their prosecutions of it, according to the ecclesiastical law, except in such cases as were contained in and specified by the statute.* The saving clause of the statute and the earliest decisions of the courts of common law suppose and assert the same view.

“This act (says Stillingfleet) did not abrogate the ecclesiastical laws as to simony, it only enacted some particular penalties on some more remarkable simoniacal contracts as to benefices and orders, but never once went about to repeal any ecclesiastical law as to simony, or to determine the nature and bounds of it.”

Such was the opinion of Stillingfleet. Again, Archbishop Wake, in one of his visitation charges, says, “This act was not privative of the jurisdiction of the Church, but rather accumulative—it leaves the Church all the authority it had before.”

So complete is the power of the ecclesiastical courts as to simony at this day, that where the canonical law has imposed a severer punishment on such an offence than the statute law, when the latter punishment has been awarded, the former may be sued for in the spiritual courts; and should the common law courts refuse to entertain a suit, as not within the words of the statute, the suitor has his remedy in the ecclesiastical courts, under the

* In the case of *Risby v. Wentworth*, in the 41st year of Elizabeth, “the court agreed that simony might be tried more aptly in the spiritual courts and consultation was awarded accordingly; and also in the case of *Baker v. Rogers*, heard in the 42d and 43d years of the same reign, the judges decided “that it appertains to the spiritual courts” to determine simony, and not to this Court of Common Pleas.”

provisions of the canon law. By the oath contained in the canon of 1603, every clergyman before he can be instituted to any ecclesiastical dignity, must swear, "That he has not made any simoniacal contract or promise, directly or indirectly, by himself or any other person whatsoever, for the procuring of that ecclesiastical dignity;" nor will, at any time thereafter, pay or satisfy any such contract as may have been made for that purpose, by any other person without his knowledge or consent.

Seeing, then, that the oath against simony was part of the ancient as well as the present constitution of the Church, and that no jurisdiction is exercised over it by the statute of Elizabeth, or any notice taken of that statute by the oath of 1603, we must allow that the words of that oath must be interpreted according to the former canons of the Church in which her notions as to the crime of simony are clearly set out and explained, and not according to the act of Elizabeth. And that every person who may have made any kind of promise, such as is provided against by those canons, though it may not be such a promise "of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit" as is specified in the statute, is guilty of perjury, if he take the "Institution Oath" contained in the 40th canon of our Church.*

Having thus brought to a close our history of canonical simony, we will now proceed to the consideration of that crime of which, under the name of simony and corrupt presentation, the courts of common law are enabled to take cognizance by virtue of the provisions of the statute of Elizabeth. Statute simony, when considered with regard to the object for whom the simoniacal contract has been made—the clerk to be presented through those means—readily divides into two distinct classes. The principle of the division being, the knowledge or ignorance of the act of simony possessed by the person in whose favour it has been committed. If he was conscious of the act he becomes a *simoniacus*,—if ignorant, merely *simoniace promotus*; in the former case he is punished equally with the other actors in the matter, in the latter he escapes with inferior penalties.

It is simony of the higher class† to contract with the patron of a church or any kind of ecclesiastical dignity, during the fullness of that dignity, for the payment of a sum of money to that patron as soon as you shall be inducted to the dignity on its next avoidance; to purchase, either for the purchaser's own benefit,

* See Gibson's Codex, page 102, vol 1.

† Were we to cite the various cases on which these divisions of simony rest, our article would assume such a professional character, as to deter some of our readers from any further perusal of it.

or for the benefit of any other clerk intended to be promoted, the next presentation to a benefice, whilst the church is full, or the incumbent lies "in extremis," if with the intention of presenting either the purchaser or any other particular clerk named at the time of the contract; for one who is in holy orders, or any other person in his behalf, to contract with the wife of a patron, or any one who may be fairly supposed to be able to influence his decisions, for being presented on the next avoidance of the patron's benefice—and it matters not whether the patron with whom the contract has been made is the true or the false patron, as far as the penalties incurred by the nominator and his nominee, and all actors in the matter, are concerned.* At first it was considered that such contracts as the above, if entered into by a father in behalf of his son, were not simoniacal, under the plea of a parent's duty of providing for his offspring. But as the duty of providing for one's self was equally binding—and the reasoning, if carried out, would have admitted the very contracts, for the exclusion of which the act had been framed—it was decided, in full court, that such contracts were simoniacal, and, according to our division, simony of the highest class.† It is a similar offence for a father to contract with his son to allow him a certain annuity until he is instituted to a living of a certain specified value, the son entering into a bond of the same date with the grant of the annuity, to qualify for orders as soon as possible, and to accept such a living when offered to him. And, lastly, it has been determined that where a clergyman, for the sake of being instituted to a benefice, enters into an agreement with the patrons to accept such a consideration for certain disputed tithes as will prevent him from ever disputing the right at law or equity, and for the sake of the agreement is presented, he is a simoniac.§ Nor would it seem to make much distinction

* Notwithstanding the many judicial decisions, that the purchase of the next presentation for any particular clergyman was an act of simony under the provisions of the statute, it began to be doubted in the beginning of Queen Anne's reign whether such a purchase by the clergyman himself was within the statute; to set this matter at rest, and to prevent the prevalence of the very worst kind of simony, as that undoubtedly was, if the meaning and not the letter of the law was considered, the act of the twelfth year of Queen Anne was passed, declaring such a buying or contracting, simony within the statute, and, according to our division, simony of the highest class. Mr. Fearne did not consider a purchase of an advowson in fee, by a clerk, and a presentation of himself, on the death of the incumbent, to be within the statute of Anne, or the employing another to purchase for him—but, surely this falls within the Institution Oath.

† The earliest decision in favour of the father's right was given in the case of *Smith v. Shelborn*, in the 41st year of Elizabeth, against the opinion of the Chief Justice, and was reversed in the case of *Winchcomb v. Pulleston*, in the 15th year of James I. with the consent of all the Judges.

§ The case of *Rex v. Bishop of Oxford* is too curious to be omitted. "A chapel in a township was endowed with the vicarial tithes in 1428, and the right

when the contract has been once entered into and signed, whether the patron exact the conditions of the contract or present the simoniac gratis; for the intention to accept the benefice on those terms having been clearly shown by the bond, no one with such intentions can ever be a fit and proper person for the holy office of minister. If, without the knowledge or consent of the object of the contract, a corrupt agreement is made with a patron, or any one who has power over his decisions, for the next presentation to a living; or a father obtain a similar benefit for his son, for the consideration of marriage, without the knowledge of his son; or after that a church has fallen vacant, and a clergyman has been promised the benefice by the patron, but not instituted by the ordinary, any one makes a contract with the intended incumbent to permit the patron to retract his promise, and to present either the son of the contractor or his nominee, in consideration of some corrupt gift to the party thus turned out, and the contract be entered into and signed without the knowledge of the object for whose benefit it was made, it is simony under the statute, but of that inferior class in which the incumbent thus instituted becomes "*non simoniacus, sed simoniace promotus.*" It has been very lately decided by the Court of Error, against the judgment of the Queen's Bench, that when a living has fallen vacant by the operation of the law, the patron cannot sell the next presentation to it with the advowson: as although the patron had neglected to evict the original incumbent after he had committed such an act as rendered the living vacant, yet as the living was by law then vacant, no sale could be made of the presentation; and in that case the clergyman whom the purchaser of the advowson had nominated, was declared to be illegally appointed, and a claim for tithes instituted by him was rejected. The nominee of the purchaser of the advowson who had not purchased it with the intention of presenting any particular clergyman, became through that decision, not a simoniac, but merely one "*simoniace promotus;*" this was the last decision that we know of respecting statute simony.* The simony

of nominating the curate given to the inhabitants. By an inclosure act of 1797 it was recited as a doubt, whether the curate was entitled to the small tithes, or a *modus* in lieu of them. On a vacancy in 1801 the inhabitants present A, stating that he was to receive a certain money payment out of certain lands, and that the inhabitants thinking his stipend too small, voluntarily agreed to allow him the sum of 29*l.* odd, provided that the additional payment should not in any way alter the payment of 40*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.*, wherewith the lands had been from time immemorial charged, thus declaring the *modus*, instead of the right to tithes, which A agreed to accept for the consideration of the extra stipend; this was decided to be simony." East's Report, vol. 7, 600.

* Case of *Alston v. Atlay*, decided by the Exchequer Chamber overruling the King's Bench. Alston, whilst incumbent of Cowsby, accepted the living of

Canon and Statute Simony.

or non-simony, according to the statute, in the purchase of advowsons and next presentations, seems to depend upon the intentions of the purchaser. If he intends to present any particular person, and contracts for the power for that particular purpose, the act is within the meaning of the statute; but if, on the other hand, the purchase is made without any such intention, then it is not statute simony. Nor does it savour of that crime, to exact from a clergyman, as the condition of his being presented, any contract, not for the benefit of the patron, but of the parishioners and of the whole church: such as a bond that he will never be absent from his parish for eighty days in any one year, or hold any other living by which his undivided attention may be lost to his former parishioners; nor to agree to pay an annuity to the widow and children of the last incumbent, until her eldest son shall obtain a benefice. Such contracts are neither within the meaning nor intention of the statute, and the judges have always been very tender of stretching the bounds of that act, as there is still another court cognizant of the crime. The distinction taken in another case, seems to be rather too fine to bear the test of reconsideration; the case was of this nature:—A covenanted with B that, in consideration of a marriage between the son of the former and the daughter of the latter, A would settle certain lands, and B certain sums of money, on the new married couple; besides this, in the same deed appeared a covenant from B to procure the living H for his son-in-law, on its next voidance. This contract was held to be out of the provisions of the statute, as a covenant independent of the marriage, and without any apparent consideration. What might be the decision of the present courts of law on such a subject we cannot say; but if we were the promoters of the suit against Mr. B.'s son-in-law, we should not fear the event of the action, although the dicta of Bramston, Jones, Coke, and Berkley, the judges in this action, were cited against us.*

Our sketch of the metes and bounds of statute simony completed, the forfeitures, disabilities, and punishments incurred by that offence, call for our consideration. "*Presbyter si per pecuniam,*" said the Canon Law, "*ecclesiam obtinuerit, non*

Odell; the patron of the former living then sold the advowson to Lloyd, who presented Atlay to the benefice. It was held that the living being vacant by the acceptance of the second cure, the next presentation could not pass with the sale of the advowson, and that consequently the nominee of the purchaser was not the proper incumbent. See Adolphus and Ellis, King's Bench, Mich. Term, 1837.

* The case of *Byrte v. Manning*, decided in the eleventh year of King Charles I.

solum ecclesiâ privetur, sed etiam sacerdotii honore spoliatur;" and again, the same law enacted that "honore male acquisito careat, et emptor, et venditor, et intervenio, nota infamiæ percellantur." The statute penalties admit several divisions, according to the person punished, whether he is incumbent, patron, or ordinary; and the former of these three is again divisible into an incumbent "simoniacus" and one only "simoniace promotus." The design of the statute in inflicting pains and penalties on the unconscious object of the illegal contract may, at first sight, appear harsh and unnecessary: but when we consider that it is an appeal to our good feelings, in direct opposition to our love of gain, we must admit that the framers of the act were right in thus adding one more defence to the purity of our Church, against the covetousness of evil-minded patrons. If the sense of his duty to himself, and what he owes to the public, will not restrain a patron from the guilt of simony, perhaps even with the most covetous of men, some regard for the person whom he intends to benefit by his crime, may have a more powerful influence over his conduct.

A simoniac incumbent is liable to forfeit double the value of one year's income of his benefice, or of the reward he may have taken for corruptly resigning or exchanging a benefice, with a cure of souls; to be indicted and punished for perjury if he has taken the institution oath; to be deprived of his tithes from the time of the act of simony, as all right to them has been taken away by the corrupt contract; and lastly, he can never be presented to the same benefice again, or perhaps to any other, and his crime is specifically exempted from the benefit of all general pardons. If the incumbent be merely simoniace promotus, he does not incur the pecuniary forfeit; and although evicted from his benefice, he may yet be restored by the authority to whom, under such circumstances, the right of presentation may attach: until he is thus re-presented, his right to tithes is extinguished, and he is barred from suing for them in any court of law. Previous to the reign of William and Mary, any act committed by an incumbent by virtue of his office, was null and void; but, by an act passed in the first year of their reign, leases granted by a simoniac were expressly excepted from the statute, unless the person to whom the lease had been granted could be proved to have been conscious of the simony at the time of the grant. Whether a court of equity would compel the incumbent who, for the sake of a fine or reward to himself, had granted a lease on terms injurious to the living, to refund so much as would compensate the injury, is a point unconnected with the matter of simony, and would be

decided on principles and precedents entirely irrelevant to our present subject. The legal patron who presents for a corrupt consideration, by his act of presentation transfers his right to present for that turn to the crown, and incurs a fine of the same amount as that imposed upon his nominee. If his was not the legal right of presentation, then the legal patron stands in the place of the crown. Should the corrupt contract have proceeded so far, that the simoniac is actually inducted, neither the King, nor any other person to whom, under such circumstances, the turn belongs, can present until the actual incumbent has been evicted from his cure by legal process: where, however, induction has not taken place, as by the act of simony the presentation is void, the patron, whoever he may be, may present another clergyman, as if the cure was void by death or removal. It very often happens that the right of presentation to many livings is vested in one person, and that of nomination in another, in which cases the simony of the one does not affect in any way the right of the other. By the statute of William and Mary, to which we have referred before, an alteration of some importance was made in the statute of Elizabeth. By the latter act, if a patron, who had made a corrupt presentation, died previous to the incumbent whom he had presented, and that incumbent was allowed to remain undisturbed in his cure, and allowed to die in the possession of it, or to be translated to another without having been charged under the Act—still, whenever the living fell vacant, simony might be proved against the dead patron, and the right of presentation transferred from his innocent successor to the crown. By the act of William and Mary this crying injustice was abolished, and no act of simony allowed to be pleaded against the rights of the innocent patron or his nominee, unless the simoniacal incumbent or his patron had been indicted in the lifetime of the former.*

“There is of late,” says Degge, “a practice introduced by corrupt patrons, that if not early nipt in the bud, will make this law (the statute of Elizabeth) of none effect:—I mean the bonds for resignation.” The question of the validity of

* The preamble states:—Whereas it hath often happened that persons simoniac, or simoniacally promoted, have enjoyed the benefits of such livings many years, and sometimes their lifetime, by reason of the secret carriage of such simoniacal dealing;—And after the death of such simoniac person, another person, innocent of such crime, and worthy of such preferment, being presented or promoted by another person innocent also of such contract, have been troubled or removed on pretence of lapse or otherwise, to the prejudice of the innocent patron in reversion or of his clerk, whereby the guilty go away with profit of his crime, and the innocent succeeding patron and his clerk are punished, contrary to all reason and good conscience.—For prevention whereof be it enacted, &c.

bonds of resignation is so closely analogous to that of statute simony, that we may be allowed to offer a few remarks upon it as a conclusion to our paper. The decisions of the law courts have divided these bonds into two kinds, special and general. In the former, the condition is to resign in favor of a certain person specified in the bond, as soon as he shall be canonically capable of being presented to the benefice. In the latter, the temporary incumbent is bound to resign on request. From the time of the Elizabethan statute to the year 1783, general bonds were always held to be legal by every common-law judge. In the case of *Peel v. the Countess of Carlile*, in the sixth year of King George II., the court refused to let the defendant's counsel argue the validity of such bonds, they having been so often established, even in equity; and in the case of *Grey v. Hesketh*, Lord Hardwicke said, "These bonds are held good at law, and so they are in equity, unless an ill-use is attempted to be made of them, in which case that court will interfere."

These unanimous decisions of the law authorities seem to have met with the equally unanimous reprobation of our Bishops, and many fruitless attempts were made by them to remedy the evil; still the judges remained firm and the legislature seemed unwilling to interfere. Thus matters remained until the Bishop of London brought things to a crisis by refusing, in 1781, to admit the Rev. J. Eyre to the rectory of Woodham Walters, in Essex, on the presentation of L. D. Fytche, the legal patron, because a general bond of resignation had been the reason why the Rev. Mr. Eyre had been presented. The patron forthwith brought his writ of *Quare Impedit* against the Bishop in the Common Pleas, and that court having unanimously recognized the validity of the bond, the Bishop brought his Writ of Error in the King's Bench; the judges of the latter court affirmed the decision of the court below. On this judgment another Writ of Error was brought by the Bishop in the House of Lords, in the year 1783; counsel were heard, the Judges summoned, and certain questions having been proposed to them, seven of them delivered their opinions that such a bond was not corrupt or illegal within the meaning of the statute, and that consequently the presentation was not void; one alone, Baron Eyre, held the contrary opinion. The point was warmly debated, and the eloquence of Lord Thurlow, joined to the honest zeal of the Bishops, so far prevailed, that the opinion of Baron Eyre was affirmed as law by a majority of one. The consequence of this decision was, that the judges considered themselves bound to follow it in such cases alone as were identical in every respect with the case on which the decision had been given; and, consequently, whenever

a difference could be drawn, the established series of precedents was always followed in preference to the majority of one.*

General bonds having been thus disposed of, a series of attacks were commenced against the special class of resignation bonds. But with respect to these also, the views of the lower courts of law were not to be shaken, and bonds conditioned to resign in favour of the son or nephew, or other blood relation of the patron, were held to be legal; and in a case where a father and son had agreed to suffer a recovery, on the condition that a certain sum of money should be paid by the son to the father; and also that in case a certain living should fall vacant during the lifetime of the son and his younger brother, the son in whose favour the recovery was to be suffered, should present the younger brother to the living, the court held that, at common law, the good could be separated from the bad, and the bond, so far as it was for a good purpose, considered legal. Forty-three years after the decision in the House of Lords against general bonds, the House was called upon to decide on a bond of the other kind. A clergyman of the name of Fletcher had given a bond to the patron, Lord Sondes, to resign on request, in favour of a younger brother of his lordship's, under a penalty of some thousands; on the request being made he refused to perform the conditions, and Lord Sondes brought an action of debt for the penalty. The Courts of the Exchequer and King's Bench supported the validity of the bond, and drove Fletcher to an appeal to the Lords. The Judges were again summoned; Littledale, Burrough, and Best admitted the validity of the bond; Garrow, Hullock, Park, Graham, Alexander, and Abbott, considered such bonds illegal. After several adjournments, the House, acting on the advice of Lord Eldon, decided unanimously against the bond. As the effect of this decision being to subject numerous innocent patrons to fines and forfeitures, the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the evening of the day of the decision, brought in a bill of a retrospective character, to relieve all patrons, who had entered into such bonds previously to the decision, from fines and forfeiture, and to establish all such bonds already made as legal. In the year following, the parliamentary power of ecclesiastical patrons so far prevailed as to convert the retrospective bill into a perpetual prospective act, and to declare, by the 9th Geo. IV., chapter 94, that henceforth all special bonds entered into *bond fide*, previous to presentation or appointment, should be exempt from the penalties imposed by the statute of Elizabeth, and be

* When the House divided, there appeared nineteen for declaring the bond illegal, and eighteen in support of the decisions of the lower courts.

considered, from the date of the act, statutably legal. One very important condition was imposed, namely, that the person named in the bond, in whose favour the resignation was to be made, shall be "either by blood or marriage, an uncle, son, brother, grandson, nephew, or grand-nephew of the patron, or one of the patrons of the spiritual office."

The stamp of legality having been impressed on the bonds, equity cannot relieve against them, unless converted to an improper use ; were such a bond to be made the means of preventing an incumbent from demanding tithes of his patron, or the patron had offered to stay all action on the bond for so many hundred pounds, or instead of requesting the incumbent to resign when the proposed person was canonically qualified to succeed to the cure, he had accepted an annuity as the price of non-disturbance, in all such cases the Court of Chancery would relieve against the bond as opening a door for simony.

The power of the ordinary to refuse to accept a resignation in pursuance of such bonds is still a matter of doubt, though an opinion prevails through the legal profession, that unless some further reasons were adduced than the mere fact of such a bond, the ordinary would hardly be justified in such a refusal. Whether the Bishop accept or not, the clergyman who has bound himself to vacate at a certain time, has also bound himself to obtain the Bishop's acceptance of his resignation ; and unless he can do so, will be liable for the penalty of the bond.

The benefit conferred by the statute which legalised these bonds may well be questioned, when the present effect of this warming-pan system is considered. How far a clergyman, who accepts a temporary cure by virtue of such a bond, when he is conscious that, were it not for the condition contained in the bond, he would not be presented ; or consents to accept a living which has been purchased for him, though technically without the terms of the statute, can take the institution oath, we are unwilling to inquire. Let every man be judged by his own conscience. Let us not, however, flatter ourselves that the fearful crime of simony is on the decrease, because so few cases can be brought within the grasp of the statutes, and thus made to appear on the records of our courts. Man's ingenuity will evade the strictest statute, and his love of gain will ever prompt him to make even God's house a house of merchandise.

Since this article was composed, the book which we have placed at the head of our paper has appeared ; and, although, from the strictly professional nature of the work, it but touches on those points which we have thought it proper to enlarge on, we believe we may claim it on our side of the question. Taken as a compilation of cases, so useful to the professional man, it is a

work of much care and accuracy : but if looked on as a treatise, it exhibits the usual want of broad principles to be found in almost all our lately concocted legal books. We are afraid to recommend it, as a manual, from its unwieldy size ; a beauty in the eyes of a lawyer, though hardly so much esteemed by the rest of the reading world.

ART. IV.—*Demosthenes upon the Crown.* Translated, with Notes. By HENRY LORD BROUGHAM. London: Knight and Co. 1840.

VARIOUS were the surmises to which the first announcement of a forthcoming translation, by Lord Brougham, of the speech of Demosthenes upon the Crown, gave rise in the literary world ; and various the opinions prematurely delivered upon a topic which appeared to excite more than ordinary interest in the minds of those who had hitherto regarded with distrust and doubt the multifarious productions of his Lordship's pen. The versatile genius, the omniscient empiric, the would-be philosopher, theologian, metaphysician, orator, statesman, politician, mathematician—πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφή μία—was again, in despite of many former rebuffs, and no little obloquy entailed upon him by certain previous publications, about to enter the literary arena, and exhibit in a department in which he had, as yet, ventured to make but little display—that of classical scholarship. The noble author was determined to shew that his attainments are boundless, inexhaustible. On what subject could he *not* make a book ? was to be the question for admiring posterity.

Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes,
Augur, schœnobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit !

Curiosity was awakened far and wide ;—no doubt considerably to the advantage of the publisher, and an excellent substitute for intrinsic merit in the aristocratic bantling to which his press was destined to give birth. A translation of “the greatest oration of the greatest of orators” by one to whom universal consent has awarded so distinguished a place among the eloquent of modern times, could not fail to excite a host of various expectations in the minds of all who had heard anything about Lord Brougham or his writings. Some few of his Lordship's most staunch supporters confidently predicted complete success in the undertaking ; others, who have always looked with suspicion upon his miscellaneous acquirements, and

entertained very serious misgivings as to his soundness in classical scholarship, were far from sanguine about the result of what they deemed a decidedly rash experiment on the part of the noble editor; while such as maliciously maintain that Lord Brougham is nothing better than an universal sciolist, anticipated a failure, of which the subsequent publication of the work has afforded many convincing proofs.

The impression left upon our minds by a perusal of this extraordinary translation, with its accompanying luminous and original commentary, was much such an one as an "interesting" culprit on his way to the scaffold is likely to create in the compassionate spectator. For, while we felt that very rash and unwarrantable presumption was doomed to meet with very signal and deserved punishment, in the contempt which his Lordship's production could not fail to excite, we, at the same time, pitied the hard fate which the writer was bringing upon himself by his own indiscretion—a fate which, if he can feel anything, he is sure to feel acutely. We cannot contemplate without commiseration our author's crest-fallen appearance in the House of Lords, his humbled mien among his literary admirers, his lame apologies to his irate and deluded publisher, his complete degradation in the eyes of the classical world, and his own ill-disguised chagrin at being unexpectedly crushed to annihilation by what was intended to have been the coping-stone of his glory! Never was a greater abuse and misapplication of talent exhibited than in the present work. Lord Brougham is about as fit to translate Demosthenes, as Mr. Alderman Harmer is to sit as Lord Mayor of London. Had his Lordship ever examined the nature and composition of a modern classical publication, even of the humblest pretensions—had he sought the counsel and followed the advice of any one but Dr. Arnold—he would have seen his folly, and not have put forth quite so hastily a work, which is destined to be a lasting proof of his utter incompetency, in almost every essential point, to become the translator of so vast a genius, so unapproachable an orator, as DEMOSTHENES.

We are no advocates for that ferocity of criticism which seizes, with ravenous tooth, upon an unfortunate victim, and rends it piecemeal with a savage joy very little short of absolute malignity; still justice to the public demands, that a candid and unbiassed opinion should be delivered upon every work reviewed, be its author a plough-boy or a duke—for these are not times when a great name will disarm criticism of its terrors. So far, indeed, is this from being the case, that great names would now seem to be carefully selected by most as legitimate

objects of attack, while the herd of humble blunderers is summarily dismissed as altogether beneath the notice of the critic.

The fact is, the most casual and superficial glance at the work now before us sufficiently proves that, in the eyes of every real scholar, the translator must henceforth have fallen, like Lucifer—never to rise again. An irreparable blow has his Lordship dealt his literary renown by injudiciously handling weapons which were sure to recoil upon his own unconscious head. Indeed, Lord Brougham may be fairly said to have committed a literary suicide; and it now only remains for a lenient public to give a verdict of *Temporary Insanity* upon the infatuated writer. *Ne sutor ultrà crepidam* is a salutary motto, to which our noble author has evidently turned a deaf ear. He does not appear to have been aware of the danger of playing with edged tools; and Greek is an ugly thing for the uninitiated to tamper with. We do not in the least wish to quarrel with his Lordship for making a fool of *himself*—especially as this peculiar ambition is manifested in most of his writings,—but to make a fool of DEMOSTHENES is a crime of too heavy a nature to be passed over without the severest animadversion. The glorious Greek has surely been long enough in purgatory under the treatment of stolid grammarians, careless transcribers, pedantic commentators, and modern sciolists; and to be after all *translated* by Lord Brougham is a dreadful and undeserved visitation, not to be regarded without feelings of compassion for the injured, and of indignation against the presumptuous offender. But a truce to our lengthy preamble: we must proceed to our task.

The first question which will naturally be asked is this—For what purpose, and for what class of readers, did Lord Brougham chiefly intend his work? The orator, the scholar, the learner, or the general reader? for it is evident that a publication of this nature cannot very easily be adapted to the requisitions of all. That his Lordship's object was solely to display *his own* scholarship, is an idea which we, for our own parts, were determined, if possible, not to admit till a perusal of his book should have compelled us to arrive at such a conclusion. Or was the work, perchance, undertaken with the benevolent intention of supplying schoolboys with a better English translation of the Oration on the Crown than had yet appeared—a task, by the way, of no very great difficulty, if accurate and close rendering be deemed tests of excellence? His Lordship's preface will probably solve this question.

Accordingly, in page x. of the Introduction, Lord Brougham tells us that one great object which he had in view, was “to assist

the student of the Greek language as well as the student of the rhetorical art." In the same page we are further informed that an additional motive was the wish "to convey to persons unacquainted with the original, some notion of its innumerable and transcendent beauties." And, shortly after, it is distinctly intimated that the conviction of the applicability of so noble a specimen of ancient eloquence to the purposes of modern oratory, has been a further inducement for preparing this translation.

It is somewhat satisfactory, then, to know that Lord Brougham does not profess or pretend to write for *scholars*. Indeed, the whole tenour of his notes, which are all singularly puerile, bear ample testimony that such could never have been his object. He intimates, that, considering a mere Greek scholar, if ignorant of rhetoric, incompetent to produce a spirited and really oratorical English version, he has ventured to attempt one himself, as being better qualified on that head than any of his predecessors; while he has, it is to be feared, paid too little attention to the still more evident truth, that a mere rhetorician, if no Greek scholar, is even less competent to produce an accurate translation than the former is to give a spirited one.

In page x. we likewise find an announcement very startling to rash reviewers,—viz., that Dr. Arnold has himself examined and revised the translation and notes throughout almost the whole of the work: so that when we attempt to call in question the accuracy of any part of Lord B.'s translation, we are not very indirectly impugning either the scholarship or the diligence of Dr. Arnold—the former of which, at all events, no one in his senses will do,* whatever suspicions may be entertained of the latter. In plain language, Lord Brougham has endeavoured to screen his blunders, if not from view, at least from criticism, by interposing a great name between himself and his reviewers; for he very discreetly informs us, that if there be any mistakes, they must of necessity occur in the small portion of the work which has not had the benefit of Dr. Arnold's superintendence. Alas for Lord Brougham! The entire translation is so thickly studded with blunders, that it is by no means easy to specify to what particular portion he alludes!

Now, the situation in which Dr. Arnold has allowed himself to be placed is by no means an enviable one; because, if the statement of Lord Brougham,—who evidently relied on the assistance of that distinguished scholar,—be, as we are bound

* Except *Fraser's Reviewer* (Mr. George Burges), who denies, *more suo*, that Dr. Arnold ever exhibited the smallest share of scholarship.

to believe, a simple undisguised fact, we are compelled to conclude that Dr. Arnold has betrayed his trust, and allowed the work to go to press with all "its blushing blunders thick upon it" from his Lordship's pen. To Dr. Arnold, then, more than to Lord Brougham, must the numerous errors in the translation be attributed; and upon Dr. Arnold will the blame fall the heavier, in proportion as errors of palpable carelessness (especially when combined with betrayal of trust) are really less pardonable than those of ignorance.

However meritorious and valuable Lord Brougham's translation may be as an oratorical composition—though we have in vain endeavoured to discover its beauties as such—as an *accurate, close, and faithful* version of the original, it is altogether worthless. The most unhappy admission in Lord Brougham's Introduction is (p. xvii.) that his Translation professes to be "as close as it is possible to make it without abandoning the *peculiar idiom* (ἰδιὼν ἰδιῶμα) of the language in which it is written." For such abandonment, and general laxity of translation, his Lordship is, throughout his notes, continually reviling the previous translators; and it is, therefore, doubly unfortunate that he should have himself incurred the very charge which he brings against others.

The notes, as we have already intimated, are of a very shallow and trifling description. They consist chiefly of a dry, unprofitable detail of the blunders which former translators have committed; of extracts from lexicons, scraps from commentators, gratuitous indications of real or imaginary oratorical beauties, clumsy attempts to elucidate well-known idioms and constructions, smatterings of criticism, and sundry amusing pieces of information on the meanings of words. The previous translations of this Oration by Leland, Francis, Dawson, and Co., upon whom Lord Brougham delights to be severe, are notoriously incorrect, clumsy, and lax. Small must be the ambition that should care to surpass them; and small the credit which would attach to him who had succeeded in doing so.

Before we proceed to examine the manner in which the Translation before us has been executed, it will be necessary to make a few remarks upon the editions which his Lordship enumerates at the conclusion of his introduction, as having been his chief authorities and guides in the performance of his task.

The Greek text, at the end of Lord Brougham's work, is rightly printed from Bekker's edition;* from which the various readings might also have been taken, as being more accurate and copious than those of Reiske, Taylor, and Wolf. Lord Brougham's

* The marginal pages should, however, have been added both in the text and the translation.

avowed partiality for Reiske's edition is unfortunate, because no comparison can be instituted between his and those of Bekker and Dindorf—the latter of which exhibits, we think, the best text of Demosthenes yet printed. And this avowal, followed by an eulogium upon Bekker's edition, is the more strange, because the convenient *Apparatus Criticus*, published separately by Schaefer, contains, among others, the entire notes of Reiske; so that the text of Reiske is now, we believe, very generally discarded by the readers of Demosthenes.* Still more do we fear that the praise bestowed upon Mr. Dobson's edition of the Greek orators will not meet with general concurrence among sound scholars. Of Bremi also, as a commentator, we have no very high opinion.

The very book of all others which Lord Brougham should have consulted throughout, he has strangely and unaccountably overlooked. We allude to the excellent edition of the Oration on the Crown by L. Disson, 1837, which contains not only *the very best Greek text*, but also a copious and most valuable commentary upon the whole; an inspection of which would have saved his Lordship from not a few of the errors into which he has now fallen. Disson's preliminary dissertation "*De structurâ periodorum oratoriâ*," would have precisely suited our translator's taste, and perhaps have enabled him to point out to us other yet undiscovered flowers of eloquence in the inimitable original. Lord Brougham has, indeed, been led by blind guides.

To go through the whole of the singular performance before us, and detail every error that has been committed, even supposing we could spare the rather extensive space necessary for that purpose, would probably be uninteresting to the majority of our readers; especially as the portentous catalogue of blunders given by the *Times* Reviewer has superseded the necessity of our pointing out every mistake, even of a graver character. We shall, however, as in duty bound, make good our asseverations by producing a few *very* choice absurdities, and let the reader infer from parts the nature of the whole.

In the first and only passage of any considerable length which we shall select for examination, as a specimen of his Lordship's competency as a translator, we need not look further than page 8. (p. 229, 6.) It is (we willingly allow for his benefit) one of acknowledged difficulty; and, accordingly, he has fa-

* *Fraser's* Reviewer, however, extols Reiske, who is the same kind of slashing emendator as himself.

voured us with a proportionate superabundance of notes upon it, by way of illustration. His Lordship's translation runs thus :

"The crimes laid to my charge are many and grave ; they are such as the laws visit with heavy, nay, the severest punishments. But the institution of this Impeachment (*ἡ προαίρεσις αὐτῇ τοῦ παρόντος ἀγῶνος*) is marked with the spite and scurrility of a personal enemy, with defamation, foul slander of my character, and every thing of the kind. Then such offences as I am accused of and attacked for, the state really has not the means of punishing with adequate severity, or anything like it, if the charges were true. No one ought on any account to be debarred of access to the people, or restrained in freedom of speech ; *but so ought no one to use that privilege for the purposes of oppression and spite (!)*. By Heavens ! Men of Athens, that is neither honest, nor statesmanlike, nor just. But if he saw me acting injuriously towards the state, especially *if I were doing the things* he has been declaiming and ranting about, it was his duty to enforce the penal laws against me while those facts were recent ; if he saw me committing an impeachable offence (*εἰσαγγελίας ἄξια*), he ought to have impeached me, and thus dragged me before you to justice ; if he saw me illegally propounding, he should have proceeded against me for Illegal Proposition. *For never can he with any justice assail Ctesiphon through me ; and yet it is plain that, had he any hope of convicting me, he never would have accused Ctesiphon (! !)*. But if he saw me doing any of those other things which he is now attacking and running down, or saw me in any way whatever injuring your interests, there are statutes for all such cases, and penalties, and sentences condemning to heavy and bitter punishments. All these he might have enforced against me ; and, had he done so, and pursued this course towards me, then, indeed, his charges would have been consistent with his conduct. But now, departing from the straightforward and the just path, and shunning all *accusation* (*ἐλέγχων*) at the time, he trumps up (*ὑποκρίνεται* ?), after so long an interval, his collected (*συμφορήσας* ?) complaints, and invectives, and scurrilities. Then, he accuses me, but he prosecutes him : he *envelops* his whole proceedings with the *fiercest* (not in the Greek) hatred of me, and, without ever meeting me fairly, endeavours to rob another of his *good name*. *Wherefore* (*καίτοι*), Athenians, over and above all the other just defences which may be set up for Ctesiphon, this one appears to me most manifestly in point, that Æschines and I ought to *carry on* our mutual hostilities between ourselves, and not lay aside our own controversy in order to try how much harm we can do another party ; for that is indeed the very extravagance of injustice."

Now observe the real and literal meaning of the Greek in the first sentence. "The crimes then laid to my charge are certainly many and grave—(*i. e.* bribery and betrayal ; Lord B. omits both *μὲν* and *οὐν*)—and such as the laws visit with heavy, nay, with the severest punishments ; but the design of the present prosecution manifests indeed the contumely, and in-

solence, and abuse, and aspersions, and all such bad feelings of a personal enemy, though the city cannot now possibly punish with anything like the rigour they deserve, the offences laid to my charge, even supposing them to be true. (I repeat, of a personal enemy)—for (Lord Brougham omits the γάρ) it is unfair to deprive a man of the right of coming before the public and making his defence, as well as to do so (*i. e.* to deprive him) by way of insult and through jealousy (a periphrastic expression for—it is unfair to deprive him through jealousy, &c.)” Now who, we ask, would infer what was the true sense, bearing, and connection of the passage, from his Lordship’s shamefully lax and inaccurate version, in which a γάρ or μέντοι is altogether omitted, and the tenor of the paragraph so perverted, that it is sufficiently evident that he was ignorant of the precise meaning of the author? The sense of the whole is simply this: The charges brought against me by Æschines are indeed heavy; but as he only alleges stale and indefinite crimes, the state cannot, as he well knows, punish me for them: which fact proves that punishment was not his object, but merely insult and annoyance. In p. 12, the words οὐσι γε τηλικούτοις ἡλίκᾳ νῦν ἐτραγώδει* (“that is, supposing them to be as great as he was just now spouting forth”) are very loosely rendered. Again, εἰσαγγελία is not simply “an impeachment,” but one of a very peculiar kind, against crimes not specially provided for in the penal code†—“an *extraordinary* impeachment.” But the *ne plus ultra* of absurd mistakes is contained in the sentence, “For never can he with any justice, &c.—the true meaning of which is about as different from that assigned to it by the noble mistranslator as it is possible to be. “For surely it can never be, that, having the power of prosecuting Ctesiphon through me, he would have refrained from directly prosecuting me, had he imagined that he could convict me.” In the same page, the note upon τιμωρίαι and ἐπιτίμια—words which he cannot understand, and thinks identical—would perhaps have been spared had he consulted Dissen, who explains most satisfactorily a passage upon which others had stumbled before Lord Brougham fell over it. Τιμωρίαι are *punishments* predetermined by law; ἀγῶνες *actions*, the procedure through which such punishments are inflicted: κρίσεις *judgments* (subsequent upon the actions), which, in those

* Fraser’s Reviewer, who wrongly asserts that τότ’ ἤδη is never used in Greek, ought to have objected to νῦν ἐτραγώδει.

† Mr. Mitchell, we observe, renders εἰσαγγελία by the simple and indefinite term *impeachment*, as opposed to an ordinary bill of indictment. See, however, Schoemann, de Comit. Ath. p. 170, seqq

trials where the penalty was not predetermined by law, (τιμητοὶ ἀγῶνες) can assign τὰ ἐπιτίμια, the amount of punishment. Lord B. is entirely mistaken in supposing that ἀγῶν here means civil, κρίσις criminal proceedings. In p. 14, "He envelops his whole proceedings with the fiercest hatred of me" is no translation of τοῦ μὲν ἀγῶνος ὅλου τὴν πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐχθρὰν προῖσταται, but it should have been rendered, "He makes his enmity against me the object of the whole action," προῖσταται being here equivalent to πρόφασιν ποιεῖται. Further, ἐπιτίμιαν is not "good name," but "civil rights;" nor does καίτοι mean "wherefore," but "and yet." Lastly, δίκαιον ἦν τὸν ἐξετασμὸν ἐχθρὰς ποιεῖσθαι is not "ought to carry on hostilities," but "ought to have conducted the discussion and settlement" of them.

The translation of the above passage is such as would hardly have been shewn up by a third-class man in the Cambridge classical tripos. There is no elegance, or energy, or smoothness, or rhetorical tone in any part of it, such as might have excused or compensated for a slight occasional inaccuracy or freedom of rendering. It is lamentable and really painful to have to expose such schoolboy blunders in a man of Lord Brougham's attainments and celebrity. It will, however, we trust, prove a salutary lesson to him in future, not to venture beyond the precincts of his own sufficiently great knowledge and capacities; and not to let a paltry ambition and love of display again lead him into such an unenviable situation as that in which he has now placed himself by this needless and uncalled for experiment in classical authorship.

On what grounds his Lordship translates ἑκατομβαιῶνος ἔνη καὶ νῆα "the 13th of Hecatombæon" (qu. 30th?) in p. 22, and μαιμακτηριῶνος δεκάτῃ ἀπιόντος "the 2nd of Mæmacterion," in p. 27, we are at a loss to conceive. That there are historical difficulties in the dates of these, and a hundred other decrees, is no excuse for departing from the Greek, even supposing Lord Brougham's version an intentional discrepancy, which we do not believe it to have been. In the latter decree (p. 27) Καλλισθένης Φαληρεὺς is translated (or rather, we believe, meant to be translated) "Callisthenes of Phalaris;" while at the end of the same decree the identical words are made to signify "Callisthenes of Phalerea:" both being erroneous, as the deme was called Phaleri, of the Antiochid tribe. Perhaps his Lordship thought one of his two guesses was sure to be right.

In p. 39, and again in p. 58, we have Διονυσίοις τοῖς μεγάλαις, τραγωδοῖς καινοῖς, ludicrously rendered, "while the new greater Dionysian tragedians acted!;" instead of, "at the great Dionysian festival (τοῖς κατ' ἄστυ), with new tragedians;" i. e. with trage-

dians acting a new play, and therefore assuming new characters. Who, or what, the *new greater Dionysian tragedians* were, must have been a question of some perplexity to our translator, if he ever bestowed a moment's thought upon the matter.

In p. 47 we meet with another beautiful specimen of close rendering: "Yet, *even then*, no one *would have* dared say that in a man bred at an obscure and paltry town like Pella, such magnanimity (?) *could be* engendered, as to make him entertain the desire of subjugating Greece:" instead of:—"Yet surely this, too, no one would presume to assert, that it was right for such a high spirit to have been engendered in one born and bred at Pella, which was *then* an obscure and insignificant place; while in you," &c.

We observe that Lord B. constantly confounds *προσῆκει* or *χρῆ* *γενέσθαι*, with *προσῆκεν* or *χρῆν γενέσθαι*; *τολμήσειεν ἄν*, with *ἐτόλμα ἄν*; and *εἰ τολμήσειεν* with *εἰ ἐτόλμα*, *et similia*. Numberless instances of mistranslation, from not discriminating between the uses of *εἰ* and *ἄν* occur in the work. When Demosthenes says *χωρὶς ἁδόξῃ* *TOTE γε ὄντι καὶ μικρῷ*, he speaks with far greater truth and precision than his translator makes him to speak: for Pella was, in the orator's time, one of the greatest cities in Macedonia, having been immensely enlarged by Philip.

Again; in the very next page, the plain and easy words *λοιπὸν τοίνυν ἦν καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἅμα πᾶσιν οἷς ἐκείνος ἐπραττεν ἁδικῶν ὑμᾶς ἐναντιοῦσθαι δικαίως*:—"It remained for you, then, and was at the same time a necessary duty, to thwart justly the unjust machinations of Philip:"—these plain and easy words are strangely rendered by a sentence of very questionable English:—"It remains, then, to confess, as a necessary consequence, that whatever be* attempted of injury against you, you *might* (may) justly resist." Both the above errors unfortunately occur in a passage which Lord B. justly extols for its unmatched eloquence, and intimates that it has long haunted him by day and night in the senate and the forum! What a pity that so much study and meditation, upon an easy passage, should have failed to suggest its meaning! We must e'en quote our translator's rash words against himself, from a very absurd note in p. 46. *The translators have not much distinguished themselves here, where they were bound to make every exertion.* We do not think they have.

In the decree of the Byzantines (p. 61) the words *ἐν τῇ ἀλίᾳ* *ἔλεξεν*, *ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς λαβὼν ῥήτραν* are falsely interpreted: "reported to the Senate, having obtained leave to speak;" instead of "proposed in the assembly, having procured a previous

* Perhaps, however, *be* is a misprint for *he*.

bill from the Senate." *ἀλία* corresponds to the Attic *ἐκκλησία*; *ρήτρα* to *προβούλευμα*, which is not *leave to speak*, though in effect it gave the power* to do so to the proposer of a measure. A little lower down, we find *πόθοδον* ποτὶ τὰν βωλὰν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον *πράτοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ* rendered *admission to the senate and assemblies near the ministers of religion!!* Near the ministers of religion! *πράτοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερὰ!!* What if the words mean "first in order *after the prayers and sacrifices*," which were offered preparatory to commencing the proceedings of the meeting, just as the Church Prayers are now read in our House of Lords?

In p. 71 we hear of "the tribe Hippothois," instead of "Hippothoontis;" and, throughout, the *tribes* are confounded with the *demes*, or boroughs. The latter error, indeed, the translator has corrected in the errata, where he tells us that Leland and others are clearly wrong in confounding the country districts with the tribes—a fact, of which we incline to think there can be very little doubt entertained.

In p. 77 we have the Greek words *σχέτλιον ἂν εἴη τοῦτό γε, εἰ τῷ τινὰ ἀρχὴν ἄρχοντι διδόναι τῇ πόλει τὰ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ ἐξέσται*, rendered: "It would indeed be hard, if a man in office were not suffered to give his own money *towards the expenses of his own department*;" instead of, "were not suffered on account of his holding office;" *διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν* being erroneously referred to *διδόναι*, and not to *ἐξέσται*, as it ought to have been.

In that refined specimen of Demosthenean blackguardism, relative to the birth and parentage of his adversary (p. 88 seqq.), Lord Brougham has, in many instances, fallen short of the real meaning of the original, and consequently much weakened the virulent sarcasm with which the great orator, who in this respect condescended to become the O'Connell of antiquity, dealt forth his unsparing personalities against Æschines. *Κάθαρμα* is much stronger than even "abomination;" and Lord Brougham's note clearly proves his ignorance that the word signifies one of those unfortunate beings, called by Aristophanes also *δημόσιοι* or *φαρμακοὶ* (Mitchell on the Knights, 1099), who were publicly sacrificed on certain occasions, by the Athenian people, as expiatory victims. These "scape-goats," or offscourings, for these are the nearest equivalent English, were as universally and heartily execrated as a "Jack Ketch" of modern times; and the term *κάθαρμα* was the most insulting that could possibly be applied. Again, *διδάσκειν γράμματα* is not "to keep a *reading* school," but, as Disen shows, and as is well known, "a school" for general education. The very next sentence *τοῖς μεθήμερινοῖς γάμοις ἐν τῷ κλισίῳ τῷ*

* Schoemann, De Comitibus Atheniensium, p. 95.

πρὸς τῷ Καλαμίτῃ Ἡρωϊ χρωμένη means, "practising her craft (that of a harlot) in open day in the brothel (ἐλισίφ—properly an out-house—not what his Lordship explains it to mean) near the statue of the hero Calamites;" and not "who celebrated daily marriages in her lodging-house at the temple of Calamites;" which is sheer nonsense. Γάμος is here a euphemism, and μεθημερινός, (which Lord Brougham has, after others, confounded καθημερινός), is added to depict more vividly her shameless and with abandoned conduct. Who the hero Calamites was, is not satisfactorily known. He appears to have been a physician of old, who first introduced *splints* of reeds (κάλαμοι) in treating fractures; or whose statue stood in a bed of reeds—see Dissen. The ἀκρον τριταγωνιστήν is not exactly a *consummate third-rate actor*, which sounds very like a contradiction, but "a capital actor of the third part" in a play.* Φορμίων ὁ Δίωνος τοῦ Φρεαρρίου δούλος Lord Brougham only renders "Phormion, the slave of Dion," carelessly. The expression οἷς ὁ δῆμος καταράται Lord Brougham did not understand, when he rendered it "one of those execrable to the people." The true meaning is, "one of those whom the people in assembly solemnly execrate;" in allusion to the custom of pronouncing a kind of *commination* upon all enemies of the state in the prayers preparatory to opening the business of an assembly.

In p. 90, "duly honouring his mother, he called her Glaucothea," is both awkward and wrong: σεμνῶς πᾶν means, "by the fine-sounding name" of Glaucothea.†

Lord B.'s notes, in p. 118 and 119, shew his entire ignorance of the nature of the *Pnyx* and *Bema*. Dr. Arnold's "suggestion" that ἄνω καθήτο means in the *Pnyx*, is no new discovery: for so it was long ago interpreted by Schoemann, *de Comitiiis Atheniensium*, p. 54, which work was published in 1817; and by Dissen, in his commentary on the passage. The *hill*, however, was not called "the Pnyx," as his Lordship supposes, but only the *field* where the people met, on the side, near the summit of the hill. Then Lord Brougham's *conjecture* that the Bema was not a *pulpit*, but only an *elevation*, shews as much ignorance as it does ingenuity. Several engravings of the Athenian Bema have been published: see, e.g. Dr. Wordsworth's "Athens and Attica,"

* The exact department of this actor will be best understood from Müller's work on Grecian Literature, chap. xxii. sec. 8.

† We object to the translation given in *Fraser's Review* of σεμνολόγους (B. p. 91.) "this man of *solemn* words;" σεμνός is frequently exactly equivalent to the English *fine*, as the *Times* Reviewer was aware. The question was asked by Mr. Burges in *Fraser*, where σεμνός means of *high birth*, in Aristophanes? Mr. Mitchell has so interpreted it in his *Wasps*, v. 638.

where an accurate as well as eloquent description of it is given, chap. x. Schoemann, p. 52. seqq., Mitchell, Aristoph. Acharn. 20.

Again, p. 144, we find some sad blundering work. The man who could translate *εἰ ἐπεχείρουν λέγειν—οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅστις οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως ἐπιτιμήσειέ μοι*, "If I should take upon me to affirm—there lives not the man who could justly blame me," instead of "If I had undertaken to say—there is no one who would *not* justly blame me," must surely be unacquainted with the first principles of Greek. The sentence proceeds, "But I am now demonstrating that those measures were your own, and shewing that the country had adopted those principles before I did; while, however, I assert that, in the execution of each design, I, too, had my share. But, Æschines, impeaching my whole conduct, and bidding you *hold me cheap*, as the cause of the country's alarms and perils, would fain strip me of the credit at this moment, *and thus* deprive you of the glory ever after." The Greek should have been rendered to this effect: "But as it is, I, for my part, am endeavouring to demonstrate that such choices were your own; and to shew that even before me the state entertained these sentiments, though I yet assert, that I, too, had a share in the service done in executing each of your measures; while Æschines, by impeaching my whole policy, and recommending you to be angry with me, as having caused the state all its alarms and dangers, is longing to deprive me of my present credit, and is for taking away *your encomiums* for ever afterwards." We have, perhaps, rendered the original too literally; but the extreme laxity of the noble and learned Lord's version will be manifest by comparison.

Wherever Lord B. has ventured to comment upon any custom, or explain any allusion to ancient practices, he has manifested his utter ignorance of archæology. A rather singular example of this occurs in p. 148, where, after translating *τῇ βακτηρίᾳ καὶ τῷ ξυμβόλῳ* "the staff and badge of justice," he informs us in a note, that these literally mean *the sticks and balls used in voting*, but that the words also mean *staff* and *badge*.

We are totally at a loss to conceive what spirit of desperate recklessness could have urged him to pen such a ridiculous assertion: for that it must have been a mere guess at the meaning of a passage which he felt himself bound to explain, cannot be doubted; as he could not have derived such information from *any authority whatever*. It is well known, that every Dicast, before entering the court in which he was to sit for the day, received a *staff*, on which was impressed the *letter* which distinguished his court (for the courts were marked A, B, &c.), and a *counter* (*σύμβολον*), the exhibition of which to the Colacreta,

entitled him to his judicial fee, τὸ δικαστικόν. See the Plutus of Aristophanes, v. 277, and Mitchell on the Wasps, v. 918.

The very celebrated passage commencing σὺ δ' ὁ σεμνὸς ἀνὴρ &c., p. 327 of Lord Brougham's text (p. 313, marg. Bekk.) has been translated so inaccurately by his Lordship, and in so much too high and *polite* a tone by Mr. Mitchell, in p. 223 of his edition of the Wasps, that we shall venture upon a more *vulgar* version of our own, which we think is nearer the spirit of the original than either of them. "But you, who think yourself such a fine fellow, and every one else only fit to be spat upon, look at MY career, and contrast your own fortunes with it! They were such, that when a child you were brought up in abject poverty, living with your father as jobbing-boy at the school, to mix the ink, to wipe the forms, to sweep the school-room, and thus holding the post of a menial, not that of a free-born youth. When grown to manhood, you used to read the books for your mother as she was initiating, and assist her in all the rest of her juggling tricks. At night you went about, tricked out in your fawn-skin, gorging with wine, and cleansing and rubbing down with loam and bran the candidates for initiation, and then packing them off from your purifications, bidding them bawl, 'I've fled the bad, I've found the good!' and priding yourself upon no one's having ever before roared and bellowed like you!—and with some reason, methinks—for don't suppose that a man who can shout so lustily could fail to howl most splendidly. In the day-time you conducted your precious band of ragamuffins through the streets, with bunches of fennel and poplar leaves dangling about their ears, squeezing your tame snakes, and holding them up in the air over your head, yelling out ΕΥΟΕ! ΣΑΒΟΕ! and kicking your heels to the tune of "Hyes Attas! Attas Hyes!" while every beldam in the place called you chief-priest, and leader, and chest-bearer, and fan-carrier; and you got your bits of gingerbread, and twists, and new-made buns for your pains. For all this, who would not envy Æschines and his fortune?"

When Æschylus, in the Ranæ of Aristophanes, quotes three of his own verses for the critical examination of Euripides, Bacchus asks the latter, "Have you anything to find fault with here?" and the poet's answer we shall apply to the above passage of Demosthenes—πλεῖν ἢ δώδεκα—"more than a dozen things." The most flagrant mistakes we shall briefly point out. The first sentence of Lord Brougham's translation, (p. 177) "But you, venerable man, who look down upon others," is intolerably weak; *Draining the goblet* is not the meaning assigned by the best commentators to κρατηρίζων. *Haybands and herbs* are different from

"fennel and white poplar leaves." Ἀνίστας is not "rising," but "raising;" perhaps, however, Lord Brougham adopted the false reading ἁναστάς. Then *Parian* (!) snakes are not exactly identical with the harmless serpents called *παρεΐαι*, mentioned by Aristophanes, and rightly described by the reviewer in *Fraser*, after Maltby's Greek Gradus, *in voc.* Λικνοφόρος is not "link-bearer," which is λυχνοφόρος, but the bearer of the "mystica vannus Iacchi," as Virgil calls it. Στρεπτοὶ are not *chains*, but a kind of plaited cake, *Anglice* "twists." Lastly, his lordship's note on the words ἔφυγον κακὸν, εἶρον ἄμεινον, which evidently terminated an hexameter verse, is not a little amusing. He tells us, that as the Greek *has no metre*, it is rather unaccountable why Francis should make two bad lines out of it! Mr. Mitchell, however, has done the same. On the allusion contained in the words, see Elmsley on the *Bacchæ*, v. 900.

We fear, however, that we have now extended these our critical remarks to a greater length than may be acceptable to the reader; and we are sure that we have done so further than is strictly consistent with the intention which we at first expressed, of not entering tediously into minute details. That the work before us is a failure, we have, we conceive, satisfactorily demonstrated. Yet amidst all these unpardonable mistakes—and we have knowingly passed over, without animadversion, numbers of scarcely less grievous ones—we willingly admit that Lord Brougham evinces that capability to comprehend and appreciate the spirit and *meaning*, if not the *language* of his author; that masterly discrimination and lively perception of the various oratorical excellences which, accompanied with even a moderate acquaintance with the idioms of Greek, might have rendered a man of his powerful intellect and extensive general knowledge, a valuable commentator and no despicable translator. In this respect we think him better qualified for the task than any of his predecessors. Yet by what fatality a performance professedly compiled from, and, as it were, built upon, so many other translations, should have turned out inferior to all in point of accuracy, is very difficult to conceive. Such, however, is unquestionably the case. What Lord Brougham *might* have done in the way of illustration, comparison, adaptation, exposition—he has not done; while the very part which he has proved himself to be utterly incapable of executing, he has unhappily undertaken. As it is, Demosthenes is belied and traduced—we had almost said *travestied*—the scholar disgusted, the English reader not edified, nor is the student of rhetoric encouraged, from the model here presented to him, to assume as his guide and preceptor the most consummate master of ancient art. For, who that can read and com-

prehend the Greek Demosthenes, would give a sixpence for the faint semblance of his sublime compositions which our modern Demosthenes has been pleased to give us? What English reader can form any just idea of such an original from such a translation? What modern orator will impart a classical air to his speeches by the adoption of such meagre verbiage? And, lastly, what schoolboy will not ensure himself a flogging by learning to construe his lesson by Lord Brougham's version of it?

Of one fact we entertain no doubt in our own minds—that all who imagine the genuine spirit of Demosthenes can be infused into an English version, however excellent as a version, must necessarily be disappointed in their expectations. Repeated failures have shewn this to be the case. It has been asserted that no translation can equal the original. The remark applies eminently to Demosthenes. To the ordinary reader, the English language will be too apt to convey English ideas. Whatever bears the stamp of a translation, will inevitably appear more or less stiff, and forced, and distorted. A literal version is sure to violate the idiom and genius of the language in which it is composed; and a free version is but an imitation. Again, to the scholar, with whom the ideas have become inseparably blended with the words which convey them, the former, when disjoined from the latter, will seem comparatively tame, cold, and apathetic: he will not brook the transmission of the glowing and impassioned original through the languid medium of another language. In the conception of the orator, we imagine that the rhetorical grandeur of a passage consists quite as much, if not more, in the energy of diction and the propriety of expression, as in the sentiments themselves; that the very sound, or turn, of a sentence, the very collocation of the words, the rhythmical close of the periods—peculiarities very difficult to preserve in translating—all impart a charm of which he was himself not fully aware, until the attempt to transfer them unimpaired to another language, proved, by contrast, the superiority of the original. Now, Lord Brougham's translation strongly exemplifies our meaning. An English reader would, we doubt not, wonder in many cases, wherein the great beauty or power of the passages which his Lordship has specified as of unusual brilliancy really lies; because, divested of the language in which they were clothed, they have, at once, lost one-half of their magnificence. In every one of our existing English translations of Demosthenes, countless instances might be adduced, where the most marked features of the original have been completely obliterated. We might find the terse converted into the flowery and diffuse; the nervous and energetic into the tame and weak; the pathetic

appeal into the dull and lifeless address ; the pointed into the indirect ; the concise into the circumlocutory ; the sublime into the mean. These perversions of the original are, perhaps, sometimes inevitable : but they are far more frequently the results of inadvertence and hurry, or a want of taste and discrimination in the translator. From whatever cause they may have arisen, they have generally rendered Demosthenes so unlike himself, that it is difficult to recognize him in his disguise. Quintilian has truly said of the Greek orator: *Tanta vis in eo, tam densa omnia, ita quibusdam nervis intenta sunt, tam nihil otiosum, is dicendi modus, ut nec quod desit in eo, nec quod redundet, invenies.* To translate Demosthenes—and the same may be said of every classical author—in the highest perfection of which the English language is capable, would be a work of very great labour. Every sentence would have to be carefully weighed, first in the original, to ascertain its precise tone, bearing, and meaning ; and next in the English version, to ensure, not only the most appropriate words as representatives of the Greek, but also the closest possible resemblance to it (consistent with the difference of idiom,) in style and structure, and occasionally even in collocation. Such a translation might, perhaps, be made with tolerable success : but Lord Brougham has contented himself with endeavouring to impart to *his* translation, a *general* Demosthenic air, which he has failed in doing, because the only true way to secure this, is by dwelling upon and carefully attending to particulars and individual sentences—by taking care of the parts, and letting the whole take care of itself.

By professing to write for the assistance of students of the Greek language, Lord Brougham has, in effect, avowed himself an advocate for the use of translations in acquiring a knowledge of the Classics. Now, as there are few points connected with classical education which have occasioned more discussion, or given rise to a greater variety of opinions, than the question concerning the admissibility of such helps in learning, a few practical observations on the subject may, perhaps, be considered not altogether out of place on the present occasion. It is well known that some, well versed in tuition, would banish translations totally from the hands of their pupils, and forbid access to them under the severest penalties ; while others, of no less skill and experience, introduce and encourage them, either unreservedly or with certain restrictions. Now, this singular contrariety of opinion can only have resulted from a great difference observed in their effects ; and this difference may be naturally supposed to depend upon the way in which they may

have been employed. In the first place, it is evident that the *use* must, in great measure, depend upon the *kind* of translation: and a little consideration will suffice to show what that should be. For, while a mere servile substitution of an English for a corresponding Latin or Greek word, which is the principal of what is called a *literal* translation, gives the student the meaning of the words *individually*, and therefore does little more than save him the trouble of using his dictionary; a more free, idiomatic, and spirited version will point out the meaning of the words *connectedly*, *i. e.* the sense of the author; and consequently supply that which the dictionary alone does not afford. The perfection of a translation (and indeed the only one that can be generally used with advantage or safety, for either of the above is mischievous) is that which conveys at once this twofold instruction. The true medium between the servile and the vague may be preserved in almost all cases with considerable success; certainly to a much greater extent than the current translations will be found to do. It is evident, that while a too literal translation may be said to defeat its own objects, a too free one has a strong tendency to induce the hasty or injudicious reader to satisfy himself with catching at the general sense, without comprehending either the construction or precise meaning of his author—a most pernicious habit, and a certain obstacle to the ultimate attainment of sound scholarship. The real tendency, however, of a free translation, depends, of course, much upon its use. If the student does not trust to it, as he cannot reasonably do, for ascertaining the construction of the original; if he merely wishes, after mastering that, to arrive thereby at the tone, and drift, and tenor of the author; or, again, if he uses it as a test of his own accuracy, that is, as a means of subsequently ascertaining whether he has understood any passage correctly—in all these cases he has made a right use of a legitimate help, and to such a student a translation will, we believe, be unobjectionable, and probably beneficial. It is reading the sentence first in the English and then in the original, which is so highly injurious; though this we imagine to be the ordinary way of using translations. We examine the construction for the purpose of arriving at the meaning: but this is taking a short cut to the latter without passing the former—it is wishing to eat the kernel without cracking the stone—and the inevitable consequence will be, that when we do not happen to have the convenient thoroughfare, we shall lose ourselves in the longer route—when we cannot procure nutcrackers, we shall look in vain for a door in the shell.

A good translator, then, will always regard the meaning of his author connectedly, as well as that of each and every word distinctively; and the one exactly as much as the other. The former will ensure a spirited without a vague—the second a close without a servile version. That these two qualities are not incompatible nor inconsistent with each other we have already observed; and that Lord Brougham has failed in ensuring either of them, an examination of almost any sentence in his work will clearly shew. Such translations as his Lordship's will never "assist the student of the Greek language," but are calculated to do him a great deal of harm; and we warn him to beware how he makes use of them.

For our own parts, we conceive that a series of accurate, literal, and careful translations of the classic authors, composed from the best texts of the originals, would be a great boon to literature. Experience proves that use will be made of this assistance, whether wisely or not, by students of almost every kind and degree; and to replace the heap of trash now current among them by standard, and as it were authorised versions, could not fail to have a beneficial effect. The art of criticism, which has, of late years, made such incredible progress, and achieved such unhopèd-for wonders in restoring and determining the text of the writers of antiquity, has not even yet, in all probability, attained its zenith. For some of the more celebrated authors, however, little more will, perhaps, be effected, unless we go beyond the cautious rules of art, and madly plunge into the dangerous system of unlimited conjectural emendation—a system which, although it may now and then find advocates; will never be able to expel from the hands of sober and thinking scholars the excellent editions of a Bekker, a Gaisford, and a Dindorff. The learned reviewer in *Fraser*, of whom we have more than once made mention, would fain suspend all translation till the Classics have passed through his own critical crucible. We ask him whether, in serious sober earnest, he would have his burlesque edition of the *Supplices* of *Æschylus* adopted, as a standard text for translation, in preference to that of Wellauer, corrupt and imperfect as it confessedly is? We think not; and we trust that he will employ his very powerful and well-stored mind in more useful ways, for the future, than in indulging his fancy by inflicting upon the ancient authors every kind of ingenious absurdity which a fertile imagination can invent. With Lord Brougham we feel, as we have pretty clearly shewn, vexed and dissatisfied, because nothing but presumption the most unwarrantable could have induced

him to undertake a work for which he is utterly unqualified. Let his failure, we repeat, be a warning to him not to outstep the limits of his own powers—and let him ever bear in mind that excellent saying of old—

ἔρδοι τις ἢν ἕκαστος εἰδείῃ τέχνην.

- ART. V.—*Bourdaloue P. Sermons pour tous les jours de Carême.* 2 tom. Paris. 1836.
2. *Works of Isaac Barrow, D.D.* Edited by the Rev. J. HUGHES. 7 vols. London. 1830.
3. *Massillon Eveque de Clermont, Œuvres.* 2 tom. Paris. 1836.

IT was the saying of Pascal, that we are accustomed to regard the ancient philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, only in the solemn drapery of dignified reflection; and, on that account, to entertain a very erroneous notion of their familiar manners. So far from being stiffened into an unnatural bearing, they laughed with their friends, and the composition of their works constituted the least philosophical portion of their lives. Pascal might have illustrated his remark from the history of his own distinguished countrymen. It is related in Spence, that Bourdaloue having been appointed to preach on Good Friday, the proper officer attended to conduct him to Church. He was directed to the study of the Father. Ascending the stairs, the brisk notes of a violin caught his astonished ear: and the door being partially open, he beheld Bourdaloue, stripped to his cassock, and keeping time to the movements of his instrument. For some time he stood in mute consternation; at last he summoned sufficient resolution to tap gently at the door. The preacher immediately laid down his violin, hurried on his robe, and coming forward with his usual composure of manner, addressed him, "Oh! sir, is it you? I hope I have not made you stay; I am quite ready to attend you." The poor man, as they were going down, ventured to express his surprise at the spectacle he had beheld. Bourdaloue replied with a smile, "Indeed, you might well be a little surprised, if you don't know anything of my way on these occasions. But the whole matter was this; in thinking over the subject of the day, I found my spirits too much depressed to speak as I ought to do, so I had recourse to my usual method of music and a little

motion. It has produced its effect; I am now in a proper temper, and go with pleasure to a duty to which I should otherwise have gone with pain."

We are enabled to give an almost parallel scene from the life of an English prelate who bore no very slight resemblance to Bourdaloue—we mean Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester. We derive the story from Mr. Gardiner, to whom it was related by Cradock, the friend of Goldsmith. Cradock, as he was one day walking up the Strand, was overtaken by Warburton in his carriage, who called out to him, "Cradock, I am going to preach a sermon before the Lord Mayor; if you have nothing better to do, get in and go with me." Cradock accepted the invitation; and the conversation, not flowing through an ecclesiastical channel, soon turned upon Shakspeare. Character after character was passed in review; and when they had entered the vestry, the Bishop, carried away by the fever of the minute, began to personate *Falstaff*, and he was in the act, we are informed, of swelling into that famous and valorous knight, when the Lord Mayor and Aldermen rushed into the vestry; and it was not without great difficulty that the excited actor and eulogist of the poet could re-assume the gravity of his episcopal raiment. Warburton did not always confine his scenical representations to the vestry. Gray communicated an anecdote, worth repeating, to Dr. Wharton. Writing in April, 1765, he tells him that Warburton, not long before, had asserted in a sermon at court, that all preferments were bestowed on the most illiterate persons; and that in speaking he turned himself about and stared directly at the Bishop of London, adding, "that if any one arose distinguished for talent and learning, there was a combination of divines to keep him down."

It was not until his mind had been matured by diligent labour and study, that Bourdaloue assumed the sacred garments of the priesthood. Several years of his life were devoted to the instruction of young persons in grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, and divinity, in the place of his birth. At length he entered the ministry; and after obtaining a wide renown among country congregations, he was called to Paris in 1669: a period, it has been observed, peculiarly distinguished for its splendour both in military and literary exploits. The victories of Turenne, the festivities of Versailles, the pens of Corneille and Racine, were the glories and the enchantments of the time. A fever of the passions had quickened the popular blood; a general excitement pervaded society. The national eyesight was dazzled with the lustre of literature and arms; the national pride was intoxicated with the music and the wine of

prosperity and fame. This was, undeniably, no favourable season for the appearance of a preacher. But the genius and energy of Bourdaloue vanquished the difficulties in his path; and while, so to speak, he darkened the theatre of life, and rolled a cloud over this gorgeous pageant of worldly distinction, he re-illuminated it with a purer light, and embellished it with more beautiful decorations. Even the heart of the voluptuous Monarch bowed under his eloquence; and he was continually recalled, in successive years, "to reason upon judgment and death," and while the sovereign trembled, to persuade him almost to become a Christian. Bourdaloue was, indeed, a Jesuit; but his piety was not embittered by the poison of Loyola. It was said that his life presented the most conclusive reply to the satires of Pascal. Towards the close of his existence, Bourdaloue resigned his pulpit for the lowlier office of visitation and consolation. The hospital and the prison became his frequent resort: and he knew, says one of his countrymen, how to be simple with the simple, learned with the wise and a logician with the acute. The sweetness of his manners and the sanctity of his conduct realised, with a delightful harmony of union, the exhortations of his pen; and he lived to shew to the world that no eloquence is so forcible in its appeal, or so alluring in its suggestions, as the silent rhetoric of a well-spent life.

While the air of France was nourishing the youthful intellect of Bourdaloue, there was growing up on the opposite shores a genius of even greater vigour and amplitude. Bourdaloue was born upon the 20th of August, 1632; Barrow, in October, 1630. It is a curious circumstance in literary history, that the masters of sacred eloquence should have arisen, both in France and England, almost simultaneously. Flechier, Bourdaloue, and Bossuet, were only divided in their birth by intervals of two or three years; while, in our own country, we find Hall, Taylor, Barrow, South, and Sherlock, forming an unbroken chain of Christian eloquence and learning. And as we see Sherlock taking up the last link which had fallen from the hand of a mightier master in Israel, so in France, Massillon, born in 1663, replaced, with a very different order of rhetoric, the majestic declamation of Bossuet. In England, our most famous satirist and our most glorious poet, appeared soon after each other. Milton was born in 1608; Dryden in 1631. In France, Corneille, Boileau, Racine, and Moliere lived to honour and applaud each other. We might pursue this inquiry with interest to ourselves, and probably with pleasure to our readers: but we forbear, and return to Barrow.

A copy of Montaigne, with the autograph of Shakspeare,

has, in our own day, almost in a literal sense, been deemed worth its weight in silver. Nor can any intellectual pursuit be more agreeable or stimulating to the mind than those journeys which an inquisitive reader is accustomed to take in the company of an illustrious author—to trace back to its secret springs the river of golden eloquence; to refresh the eye with the diversified landscape through which it has flowed; to repose in the garden of luxuriant imagery into which he is conducted, and to behold the gradual swelling and impetuosity of the stream—these are sources of high and beautiful interest. But the personal history of an author has a still livelier charm. To travel over the glories of his mind—to think with him, to feel with him, to live with him—this is, indeed, delightful. This enjoyment, however, is rarely afforded to the reader of Barrow; of his private character, as a Christian or a scholar, biography has supplied very scanty notices. He belonged to the reflective literature of his age; and had derived no popularity from any allegiance with the interests or the vices of the day. Those gales of popular opinion, if we may express ourselves, which tossed about the names of many humbler contemporaries, seem very seldom to have caught up that of Barrow. He was, in truth, above his age. Nor had he thought it desirable to build up, during his life-time, that great reputation for sacred eloquence which posterity has universally assigned to him. He only published two sermons. Tillotson, whom he had known when a student of Clare Hall, was to present them to the public, and to construct out of those precious mines his own softer and more flowing system of rhetoric.

One particular circumstance, however, of his history has been fortunately recorded, and ought to be had in perpetual remembrance. Barrow was what is commonly called a dull boy; and his father's prayer, that if God would take any one of his children he hoped it might be Isaac, has descended to posterity as a striking instance of parental delusion. The father of Barrow has not been without successors. The youthful character of Sheridan is familiar to every one; but an anecdote which has been related of Thomas Warton, the ingenious historian of our poetry, may not be in the recollection of some of our readers. Thomas, accompanied by his brother Joseph, the accomplished friend of Young, was walking with his father in the neighbourhood of Windsor. The surrounding scenery, and the solemn and animating associations of the place, appeared to produce no effect upon the boy: "There goes Thomas," said the sorrowful father, "caring for none of these things;" yet that very Thomas Warton was to become, in a few years, one of the

most elegant writers of his age; and to entertain, throughout his life, the most ardent attachment to every ancient castle and decoration of chivalry, and monastic solitude of learning. So it was with the child Barrow. Isaac soon began to dispute among the Doctors; and it ought to be considered to be the glory of his life, that he continued, during so many years, disputing and preaching in the Temple, and labouring in the service of his **DIVINE MASTER**. Barrow was not always understood or appreciated. Happening upon one occasion to preach for Dr. Wilkins, at the Old Jewry, the congregation, startled by his uncouth and shabby appearance, hastily quitted the church before he had commenced his sermon, leaving only two or three persons behind, of whom the famous Baxter was one. At another time, when he was preaching in Westminster Abbey, the officers of the church impatiently played him down with the organ, and the orator was obliged to yield to the superior lungs of the instrument. Even within academic walls, his elaborate argument weighed upon his hearers, who seemed to drag, at each remove, "a lengthening chain." To write sermons formed the employment of Barrow during a considerable period of his life. He was accustomed to copy out, with great diligence, passages from Demosthenes and Chrysostom; and the frequency of his transcriptions is attested by the manuscripts themselves. Hence that pregnancy of thought, which lends so much value to his works; and which induced Warburton to say, that when he read Barrow he was obliged to think. In the library of Trinity College are preserved thirteen volumes of Barrow's works, in manuscript, partly original and partly published. Here may be seen the first elements of his admirable creations; and here, too, may be admired his industrious collection of extracts from Demosthenes, Æschines, Plutarch, Cicero, and the Fathers of the Church. Of his preparation for the pulpit a characteristic anecdote has been told:—"We were once going from Salisbury to London (writes Dr. Pope), he in the coach with the Bishop and I on horseback; as he was entering the coach, I perceived his pockets sticking out nearly half a foot, and said to him, 'What have you got in your pockets?' He replied 'Sermons.' 'Sermons,' said I, 'give them to me, and my boy shall carry them in his portmanteau, and ease you of that luggage.' 'But,' said he, 'suppose your boy should be robbed.' 'That's pleasant,' said I; 'do you think there are persons padding on the road for sermons?' 'Why, what have you,' said he; 'it may be five or six guineas; I hold my sermons at a greater rate, for they cost me much pains and time.' 'Well then,' said I, 'if you'll secure my five or six guineas against lay padders, I'll secure your

sermons against ecclesiastical highwaymen.' This was agreed ; he emptied his pockets, and filled my portmanteau with his divinity, and we had the good fortune to come safe to our journey's end, and to bring both our treasures to London."

The inquiring spirit of Barrow swept over every field of literature ; and even the light epigrammatists—the painted butterflies of literature—were not thought unworthy of his net. His favourite writers in the classic school were Sophocles, Demosthenes, Aristotle, and, in a later age, Chrysostom ; according to Dr. Pope, he preferred Ovid to Virgil, and we have the confirmation of that statement from his own pen. In a Latin speech delivered at Trinity College, he pronounces a glowing eulogy upon the elegaic poet, whose verses he declared to be beyond the reach of art ; of a milky sweetness, of a graceful purity of language, and an equable heat and vigour of invention. Ovid has been, in one or two instances, a fortunate author. He was admired and loved by Milton, and in modern times obtained the applause, and satisfied the refined and critical judgment of Fox. He deserves a large portion, at least, of this praise ; but the general voice of criticism has not been so friendly to his claims. No writer, who has attained so lofty a seat in the Temple of Poetry, has received fewer offerings of homage. It is only at long intervals that any incense burns before his shrine, or any lamp is held over the darkness of his tomb. The serene majesty of Virgil has overshadowed him ; and the rich and variegated fret-work, so to speak of his fancy, his images of silver, and his beautiful paintings from mythology, have been neglected and despised. Yet there is a picturesque happiness in his groupings, an art in his composition, and, above all, a rich brilliancy in his colouring, that time neither destroys nor even obscures.

That Barrow, who called poetry ingenious nonsense, should have been enamoured of Ovid, is not more singular than numerous other anomalies in the intellectual character. Milton preferred Euripides to either of his rivals on the Athenian stage. Moliere thought that his own genius lay in tragedy. It is curious to find Burke sharing the partiality of Milton, and perusing, with peculiar feelings of pleasure, the aphoristic wisdom of Euripides. But Barrow's study of Chrysostom would certainly not have been traced in his sermons. It seems to have been the delight of one to amplify, of the other to abbreviate ; of one to train an image into every shape of luxuriance ; of the other, by cutting down the tendrils, to concentrate the juices in the stem. The intellectual character of the Eastern Bishop was tinged with a softness of fancy, that wore almost the aspect of effeminacy. Barrow, on the one hand, was vigorous in his mind as in his

limbs ; his frame was of iron. When a schoolboy at the Charter House, his amusements were always violent, and frequently dangerous ; nor did his youthful courage and daring ever forsake him. When sailing over the Ionian sea the ship was attacked by a corsair ; Barrow, we are told, "stuck manfully to his gun," and materially assisted in beating off the pirate. Upon another occasion he forced an infuriated mastiff to the ground, and held him there by the exertion of personal strength.

Maury declared that he knew nothing more astonishing, or more inimitable, in Christian eloquence, than the first parts of Bourdaloue's sermons on the "Conception," the "Passion," and the "Resurrection;" and another French critic, of more recent times, expresses his opinion, that the beginning of his celebrated Passion, in which he proves the death of the Son of God, to be the triumph of his power, ought always to be regarded with sentiments of wonder and delight. Bossuet, he thinks, has produced nothing superior to it. Barrow has also written a noble discourse upon the "Passion of our Lord," less harmoniously composed than the sermon of Bourdaloue, but rising, in particular passages, into a strain of a higher mood. Let us contrast a passage of rhetorical exposition from Bourdaloue, with a passage of argumentative eloquence from Barrow. The oratory of our Church presents no specimen more admirable than this ; the diction is beyond all praise for its singular clearness, simplicity, and truth :—

BOURDALOUE.

"C'est quelque chose, Chrétiens, de bien prodigieux dans l'ordre de la nature, que ce qui nous y' est aujourd'hui représenté par la foi ; sçavoir, un Dieu souffrant : mais j'ose dire que ce prodigé, tout surprennant qu'il est, n'approche pas encore de celui que la même foi nous découvre dans l'ordre de la grace, quand elle nous met devant les yeux un Dieu pénitent. Telle est néanmoins (ô profondes abîmes des conseils de Dieu !) telle est la qualité que le Sauveur du monde a voulu prendre, et qu'il a aussi saintement que constamment soutenue dans tout le cours de son adorable Passion. Tel est ce Mystère que nous célébrons : et parceque, selon l'Ecriture, la vraie pénitence consiste surtout en deux choses ; la contrition qui nous fait détester le péché, et la satisfaction qui doit expier le péché ;

BARROW.

"Another advantage of this kind of suffering was, that by it the nature of that kingdom which he did intend to erect, was evidently signified : That it was not such as the carnal people did expect—an external, earthly, temporal kingdom ; consisting in domination over the bodies, and estates of men, dignified by outward wealth and splendour, managed by worldly power and policy, promoted by forcible compulsion and terror of arms, affording the advantage of safety, quiet, and tranquillity here ; but a kingdom purely spiritual, celestial, eternal ; consisting in the governance of men's hearts and minds, adorned with the endowments of wisdom and virtue, administered by the conduct and grace of God's Holy Spirit ; upheld and propagated by meek instruction, by virtuous example, by hearty devotion, and humble

quand je dis un Dieu penitent ; j'entends un Dieu touché de la contrition la plus vive en vue du péché de l'homme. J'entends un Dieu satisfaisant aux dépens de lui-même et dans toute la rigueur de la justice pour le péché de l'homme ; deux obligations dont l'Homme-Dieu, Jesus Christ—s'étoit chargé dès le premier instant de sa vie, et dont vous allez voir, s'il s'acquitta exactement au jour de sa Passion. Car voilà les deux états et comme les deux scènes, où je vais produire ce Médiateur par excellence entre Dieu et les hommes. Le Jardin où ils s'affligea, et le Calvaire où il expira. Le Jardin où il s'affligea ; c'est-là que je ferai paroître un Dieu contrit et ressentant toute l'amertume du péché. Le Calvaire où il expira ; c'est-là que je vous ferai contempler dans sa personne un Dieu immolé pour la réparation du péché."*

patience ; rewarding its loyal subjects with spiritual joys and consolations now, with heavenly rest and bliss hereafter. No other kingdom would he presume to design, who submitted to this dolorous and disgraceful way of suffering ; no other exploits could he pretend to achieve, by expiring on a cross ; no other way could he rule, who gave himself to be managed by the will of his adversaries ; no other benefits could this forlorn case allow him to dispense."

We shall consider, more closely, the peculiar nature of the eloquence of Bourdaloue and Barrow in the closing summary of our remarks.

When Massillon arrived at Paris, he was asked to give his opinion respecting the popular preachers of the day. "I find them," he replied, "full of talent and ingenuity ; but if I preach, it shall be in a different manner." He kept his word. But, without entering into any analysis of his sermons, which would lead us beyond the limits of this paper, we may refer to that famous passage in the Discourse "sur les Elus," which has obtained so great a celebrity in traditional story. Of this passage several versions have been given ; we shall offer two, prefacing them with a very few and very brief remarks.

The writer of the preface prefixed to the edition of his works published in 1743, furnishes a few particulars respecting the appearance of Massillon in the pulpit. He entered it with the air of one oppressed by the solemnity of his meditations ; his face announced the grandeur of the truths he was going to deliver. Before he had opened his mouth, we are told, the congregation felt the spell. When at length he began to unfold his subject, the orator was forgotten in the man. Every word seemed to be spoken by nature ; and consummate art enabled him to conceal art. His manner was at once calm yet animated.

* P. 146-7. Edition, 1726. Tome premier.

Every feature, observes a contemporary, had its own eloquence. Barron, the celebrated actor, was a frequent auditor. "Mon ami," he once exclaimed to a companion, "voilà un orateur, et nous ne sommes que des comédiens." Yet Massillon, according to Maury, employed very little action; he says, that the authority with which he spoke rendered it unnecessary. The action of Bourdaloue, on the contrary, was frequent and impressive, although his eyes were usually closed throughout the entire sermon.

Eloquence has been defined, by a great master of the science, to be the power of saying things in such a manner, that they whom we address may understand them, not only with facility, but with a sensation of delight, so that the interest excited may lead the mind into reflection. It becomes necessary, therefore, to consult our own heart before we attempt to influence our neighbour's. In our own experience we shall always find reflected the physiognomy of the passions. Massillon professed himself able to paint the passions of other men, simply because he had studied his own. Thus he gave *portraits*, not *pictures*; he drew the lineaments of vice as through a glass, and presented them with all the hideousness of life. His oratory was mild, equable, and melodious; it subdued the soul with persuasion, and dispossessed the evil spirit with the music of the lyre. His was the eloquence, to cite the eulogy of D'Alembert, which went directly to the soul, agitating without overwhelming it; and penetrating without rending it. We must ourselves be touched before we can touch, is the saying of Quintilian. The wounded is the wounding heart, is the pathetic exclamation of Evesham. There is a contagion among the passions, is the observation of Blair. This was the eloquence of Massillon.

"Or je vous demande, et je vous le demande frappé de terreur, ne séparant pas en ce point mon sort du vôtre, et me mettant dans la même disposition où je souhaite que vous entriez; je vous demande, donc: si Jesus Christ paroîssoit dans ce temple, au milieu de cette assemblée, la plus auguste de l'univers, pour nous juger, pour faire le terrible discernement des boucs et des brebis, croyez vous que le plus grand nombre, de tout ce que nous sommes ici fût placé à la droite? Croyez vous que les choses du moins fussent égales? Croyez vous qu'il s'y trouvât seulement

"Now, I would ask you, and I ask you, struck with terror, not separating on this point your destiny from my own, but feeling myself the same impression that I would wish you to partake. I would ask you, then, if Jesus Christ were now to appear in the midst of this assembly (the most august in the world) to judge us, and to make the terrible distinction between the goats and the sheep, do you believe that the greatest number of us who are here present should be placed on the right hand? Do you believe that at least the distribution would be equal? Do you believe that he

dix Justes ? que le Seigneur ne put trouver autrefois en cinq villes tout entières ? Je vous demande ! Vous l'ignorez, je l'ignore moi-même. Vous seul, ô mon Dieu ! connoissez ceux qui appartiennent ; mais se nous ne connoissons pas ceux qui lui appartiennent, nous savons du moins que les pecheurs ne lui appartiennent pas. Or, qui sont les fidèles ici assemblés ? Les titres et les dignités ne doivent être comptés pour rien ; en vous serez depouillés devant Jesus Christ. Qui sont-ils ? Beaucoup de pécheurs qui ne veulent pas se convertir ; encore plus qui le voudroient mais qui diffèrent leur conversion ; plusieurs autres qui ne se convertissent jamais que pour retomber ; enfin, un grand nombre qui croient n'avoir pas besoin de conversion ; voilà le parti des réprouvés. Retranchez ces quatre sortes de pécheurs de cette assemblée sainte ; car ils en seront retranchés au grand jour ; Paraissez maintenant, Justes ; où êtes vous ? Restes d'Israël, passez à la droite ! froment de Jesus Christ, démelez vous de cette paille destinée au feu : ô Dieu ! où sont vos élus ? et que reste til pour votre partage ?”

might find here only ten righteous, which the Lord could not previously find in five cities ? I ask you ! You know not neither do I. Thou alone, O my God ! knowest those who belong to thee ! but though we know not those who do belong to him, we know at least that sinners do not. Who are the faithful here assembled. Titles and dignities ought not to be counted for nothing ; you will be deprived of all these before Jesus Christ ! Who are they ? Many sinners, who will not be converted still more who would, but defer their conversion ; many others, who never are converted but to relapse ; in fact, a great number who believe that they have no cause for conversion : this is the state of the reprobate. Take away these four kinds of sinners from this holy assembly, for they must be taken away at the great day. Appear now ye righteous ! Where are ye ? Remnant of Israel, pass to the right ! Wheat of Jesus Christ ! withdraw yourselves from the stubble destined for the fire. O God ! where are thine elect ? and what remains for thine heritage ?”

The version of Voltaire, in the *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique*, is the sublimest we have seen—the most energetic and vivid. The grand and organ-like swell of harmony closes in a fuller and richer note. There is a startling surprise in the concluding interrogation, that might well excite that sudden sensation of terror and dismay which tradition ascribes to it. One or two passages in Grecian orations will recur to the classical reader, nor will he forget the fiery appeals of Cicero. But the most apt and curious illustrations of what we will call the sublimity of a monosyllable, may be found in the indignant address of an Indian warrior, and in a sermon of the poet Wolfe. At some inconvenience we shall endeavour to exhibit these examples in three parallel columns. The first is preserved by Jefferson, in the *History of Virginia*, and is reported to have been spoken by a Mingo chief to the Governor, Lord Dunmore. The incident that occasioned it occurred in the spring of 1777, when the Indians, in consequence of a defeat, sued for peace. Logan,

disdaining to unite himself with the suppliants, and apprehensive that the absence of a chief so distinguished might awaken doubts in the minds of the conqueror respecting the sincerity of the treaty, despatched a messenger, with this noble address, to Lord Dunmore. We have been unwillingly obliged to injure the quotation from Wolfe by unavoidable curtailment. It occurs, if we remember rightly, in a sermon preached in behalf of poor children, and belongs to the same order of rhetoric as the thrilling enquiry of Massillon. Of its writer we may say, that he died too soon for the world, though not for himself. He brightened his genius by his piety; and though he has left a name behind him, we venture to believe that he is now rejoicing more abundantly that his works have *followed him!*

MASSILLON.

"Je ne suppose que ce soit ici notre dernière heure à tous, que les cieux vont s'ouvrir sur nos têtes, que le temps est passé, et que l'éternité, commence, que Jesus-Christ va paraître pour nous juger selon nous œuvres et que nous sommes tous ici pour attendre de lui l'arrêt de la vie ou de la mort éternelle. Je vous le demande, frappé de terreur comme vous, ne separant point mon sort du vôtre, et me mettant dans le même situation où nous devons tous paraître un jour devant Dieu, notre Juge; si Jesus-Christ dis-je, paraissait dès à présent pour faire le terrible separation des justes et des pécheurs, croyez vous que la nombre des justes fût au moins plus grand notre fut sauvé? croyez vous que le nombre des justes fût au moins égal à celui des pécheurs? croyez vous que s'il faisait mainte-

INDIAN CHIEF.

"I appeal to any white man to say if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if ever he became cold and naked and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war, Logan remained idle in his cabin, an advocate for peace. Such was my love for the whites, that my countrymen pointed as they passed, and said "Logan is the friend of the white man." I had even thought to have lived with you, but for the injuries of one man. Colonel Cresap, the last spring, in cold blood murdered all the relations of Logan, not sparing even my women and children. There was not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called on me for revenge. I have sought it; I have killed many. I have glutted my very cause. For my coun-

WOLFE.

"Suppose it were suddenly revealed to any one among you that he, and he alone of all that walk upon the face of this earth, was destined to receive the benefit of his Redeemer's atonement, and that all the rest of mankind was lost—and lost *to all eternity*; it is hard to say what would be the sensations excited in that man's mind by the intelligence. * * But suppose, at that moment, that the Angel who brought the first intelligence returns to tell you that there are beings upon this earth who may yet be saved; * * that some of them are within the reach of your Redeemer's love, and of your own; that some of them are now before you, and that their everlasting destiny is placed in your hands. Then, what would first occur to your mind? Privations, dangers, difficul-

non la discussion des
œuvres du grand nom-
bre dans cet église,
il trouvât seulement
dix justes parmi nous ?
En trouverait-il un
SEUL."

try I rejoice at the ties? No: but you
beams of peace. But will say, 'Lord! what
do not harbour a shall I do? Shall I
thought that mine is traverse earth and sea,
the joy of fear. Logan through misery and
never felt fear; he will torment, that of those
not turn on his heel to whom thou hast given
save his life. Who is me, I may not lose
there to mourn for ONE?"
Logan? Not ONE."

D'Alembert, who pronounced his *Eloge* upon Massillon during the life-time of Voltaire, has particularly noticed the admiration entertained by that writer for the genius of the preacher. He regarded him as the complete model of French prose, as Racine was of poetry; and the *Petit Carême* might be seen on his table by the side of *Athalie*. The eloquent Buffon always spoke of Massillon as one of the first prose authors of France; and Maury admits that he deserves a place among the greatest of her writers, though criticism may refuse to enrol him among the most eminent of her orators. Fenelon, Flechier, and Massillon are, perhaps, the completest masters of style in the whole compass of French literature. After the death of Massillon, several sermons were found in his portfolio, bearing marks of diligent revision and frequent transcription. Boileau never held the pen with a more unwearied industry, or lingered over a sentence with a livelier interest. That admirable satirist confessed to his friend Moliere, that he trembled over the choice of a word, and that of four words he effaced three:—

"Mais mon esprit, tremblant sur le choix de ses mots,
N'en dira jamais un, s'il ne tombe à propos,
Et ne sauroit souffrir qu'une phrase insipide
Vienne à le fin d'un vers remplir la place vide.
Ainsi, recommencant un ouvrage vingt fois,
Si j'écris quatre mots, j'en effacerai trois."—SAT. II.

Voltaire not only admired Massillon—he imitated him. Read the following passages, which might be easily increased:—

MASSILLON.

"Tous les autres êtres, contents
de leur destination, paraissent heu-
reux à leur manière, dans la situa-
tion où l'auteur de la nature les a
placés. Les astres, tranquilles dans
le firmament, ne quittent pas leur
sejours, pour aller éclairer une
autre terre; la terre réglée dans ses

VOL. VIII.—H

VOLTAIRE.

"L'aigle fier et rapide, aux ailes
étendues,
Suit l'objet de sa flamme clarcée
dans les nues,
Dans l'ombre des vallons le taureau
bondissant,
Cherche en paix sa gemisse, et pâit
en mugissant.

movements, ne s'élance pas en haut pour aller reprendre leur place ; les animaux rampent dans les campagnes, sans envier la destinée de l'homme qui habite les villes et les palais somptueux ; les oiseaux se rejouissent dans les airs sans penser s'il y a des créatures plus heureuses qu'eux sur la terre. Tout est heureux pour ainsi dire ; tout est à sa place dans la nature ; l'homme seul est inquiet et mécontent ; l'homme seul est en proie à ses desirs, se laisse déchirer par des craintes, trouve son supplice dans ses espérances, devient triste et malheureux au milieu de ses plaisirs ; l'homme seul ne rencontre rien ici-bas où son cœur puisse se fixer."

Au retour du printemps, le doux Philomèle
 Attendrit par ses chants sa compagne fidèle ;
 Et, du sein des luissons, le moucheron léger
 Se mele, en bourdonnant, aux insectes de l'air,
 De son être content, qui d'entre eux s'inquiète,
 S'il est une autre espèce ou plus ou moins parfaite."

Happy had it been for this high-priest of the idolatry of sin, if he had imitated the temper of Massillon, as well as his genius ; if, while he delighted his ear with the harmony of his periods, the selection of his language, and the variety of his pauses, he had received, at the same time, into his mind, those lessons of gentleness, humility, and love, which this second Fenelon diffused over his admirable writings. Happy, indeed, would it have been for the philosopher of Ferney, if, when running his eye over the most celebrated work of the Bishop of Clermont, it had been arrested by the following passage, so pregnant with instruction, so full of terrible admonition, to this arrogant chief of the modern apostacy :—" *Helas ! Sire, que sont les grands talents, que de grands vices, si les ayant reçus de Dieu, nous ne les employons que pour nous mêmes ? Ques' deviennent-ils entre nos mains ? 'souvent l'instrument des malheurs publics—toujours la source de notre condamnation et de notre perte.*"* Such a remembrance of his mortality might have awakened a thought of Christian repentance even at the feast of adulation and of pride, and over the intoxicating cup of prosperity and renown. Who does not sigh, that a genius so agile, so vigorous, so universal, should have bowed only at the feet of the Spirit of Evil ; and that the kingdom of heaven should have been ventured for the kingdom of the mind ?

The ominous cry of those fallen intelligences—exiled and driven down from the pure abodes of the intellectual heaven—of whom Voltaire was the acknowledged chief, was "*Ecrasez l'infame !*" Their imprecation has fallen upon their own heads.

* Massillon, Petit Carême—Pour le Dimanche de la Passion.

Their curse has descended to their successors—who have inherited their leprosy, but not their mantle. Nor can the rapid dilapidation of their own fame, which once overshadowed Europe with the gloom of death, fail to excite a sensation of awe and reverence in every christian mind. Voltaire was the prince of the unhallowed confederacy, and upon him the vengeance of God seems to have visibly fallen; the costly architecture of those temples which he consecrated to vice has long ago begun to moulder and to decay. He built shrines to Satan, and laboured to train up a priesthood for the service of Sin. The names of Condorcet, Diderot, and many more, are written in the same characters of fear. But they are already beginning, even in a temporal and a literary sense, to experience the doom of Babylon and Gomorrah. Who does not trace in their growing unpopularity, among all the classes of learning and of genius, the retributive justice of an offended Ruler! Like that Eastern Prince, who dazzled the eyes of the multitude with the glitter of his white raiment and the splendour of his ornaments, they appeared upon their silver thrones amid the exulting shouts of their frenzied worshippers, arrayed in sumptuous apparel, and intoxicated with adulation and pride; and, like him, the Destroying Angel has struck them with a pestilence that makes them the horror and the scorn of mankind.

Barante notices, in the later productions of Voltaire, the occasional presence of a purer and better spirit. In the midst of all the hateful frivolity, the perpetual mobility of thought which hurried him along, he sometimes utters reflections full of wisdom and truth. By these momentary flashes of light, the rent condition of society seems to attract his attention; but the moral blindness soon returns upon him, and he resumes his place in the literary Pandemonium, and marches forward in triumph, the Coryphæus of Infidelity. A modern critic has inquired, whether any spectacle can be more affecting than that of an old man insulting the Deity at the moment when his soul is about to return to Him who gave it? It is not easy to believe that, behind the curtain which impeded the public observation, no throes of agony disturbed the graceful attitude of expiring Philosophy; that over those shadows, which Death sends before its terrible approach, no torches of remorse shed their melancholy flame; or that the murderer of the soul was not haunted by fiercer Eumenides than ever hung upon the steps of the Grecian matricide. Every tribute of praise to such a man is an insult to Christianity. To applaud his genius for its brilliancy and its power, is to worship Moloch for the magnificence of his rites. In the last case the death was temporal, in the first it was spiritual. The very sweetness of the note ought to

induce us, as we pass within sight of the enchanted country, to lash ourselves to the mast with a stronger chain. For the intemperance of youth there is pardon ; for the repentance of manhood there is hope ; for the sigh of trembling age there may be mercy. Few lives are wholly and completely wicked ; the most impetuous gusts of passion occasionally open a few patches of azure sky, and some faint glimpses of sunshine colour the vapours into the bow of peace. But Voltaire was a villain upon principle. With him scepticism was a system : he laid down the rules for vice, and composed, so to speak, a grammar of blasphemy. To his page every lisping atheist turns for instruction. To praise him, we repeat, is to outrage virtue. Let him, if you will, be exalted for public observation—but it should be in the pillory. Let him, if you will, be conducted out of the commonwealth with shouts of triumph—but it should be to execution ! Nor will it be deemed among the least crimes of this legion of darkness, that they left so glittering an inheritance of sin behind them ; or that the deadly company of revolutionists who, in the words of Robert Hall, advanced with sobriety to the ruin of their country, were the intellectual children of Voltaire and his friends. Well might a benighted spirit of our own day exclaim :—

“ Lausanne and Ferney ! ye have been the abodes
Of names, which unto you bequeathed a name ;
Mortals who sought and found, by dangerous roads,
A path to immortality of fame.”

Childe Harold, Canto III.

Glorious exploit of Christian criticism ! if it can warn the rising generation by the misery and crimes of the past ; if it can disperse the magical delusions with which Circe endeavours to blind and embrate the children of literature ; if it can embody to the sight, in all their hideousness and horror, the vices and the desolation of a scornful unbelief ; if it can shew, however gorgeous the shrine which folly rears to the impiety of genius, that, nevertheless, the scourge of serpents is at the door—
Ultricesque sedent in limine Diræ.

Voltaire's obligations extended beyond the works of Massillon. He was not ashamed to borrow from Tillotson. That admirable Prelate had said, with great aptness, “ If God were not a necessary Being, he might almost seem to be made for the use and benefit of men.” Voltaire melted the thought into the following line :—

“ Se Dieu n'existait, il faudroit l'inventer.”

Sir James Mackintosh, who first noticed the plagiarism, has suggested the probable origin of the sentiment, in a mis-recollection of a passage in the second chapter of the treatise De

natura Deorum: "Multaque quæ dicentur in eis libris, colligunt, quæ talia sunt, ut ea ipsa Dei immortales ad usum hominum fabricati videantur." The surprise of Mackintosh, that Voltaire should have taken anything from Tillotson, is not particularly well founded; for Tillotson was the only English preacher who had obtained a name among the scholars and theologians of France. At a later period, Blair rose into still higher reputation, and Maury spoke of him as "le Prédicateur le plus vanté de Grande Bretagne." But Voltaire sometimes pounced upon prey in much more distant regions, and strayed into the works of the Fathers, where Milton, with a very different temper, had walked before him. In the ninth Canto of the *Henriade*, he mentions a person who lived in the court of Henry, without being corrupted by its vices. Mr. Boyd has shewn the exact counterpart of the simile, in Gregory's oration on Basil; the preacher, after alluding to the residence of himself and his friend at Athens, and saying that they had not been defiled by its manners, employs this illustration—the hero of Voltaire is Mornay—

BASIL.

"Και ειτις εστιν η πιστευεται
ποταμος δι, αλμης ρεων γλυκυσ,
ηζων εν πυρι σκαιρον ψτα παντα
αλισκεται τουτο ημεν ημεις εν πασι
τοις "ηλιξι."

VOLTAIRE.

"Belle Arethuse ainsi, ton orde fortunée
Roule au sein furieux d'Amphitrite
Un crystal toujours pur, et des flots
toujours clairs, [des mers."
Que jamais ne corrompt l'amertume

In like manner Balzac, as Melmoth has remarked, transplants an ingenious thought of Pliny's in a letter to Macrinus, where he represents the Anio invited and detained by the beautiful villas on its banks: "Cette belle eau aime tellement ce pais, qu'elle se devise en mille branches, et fait une infinité d'isles et de tours, afin de s'y amuser d'avantage."

But it was not in melo-dramatic starts of passion, or in vivid fragments of eloquence, that the power of Massillon principally resided. It dwelt rather in the whole; and for ourselves, at least, his gentler and humbler manner possesses a deeper interest. His remarks upon the Beatitudes are exquisite in their touching simplicity and homeliness. We cannot refrain from offering an extract of some length, in the confident belief that it will be perfectly new to a large number of our readers:—

MASSILLON.

"Bienheureux ceux qui pleurent, parce qu'ils seront consolés."

Matt. v. 5.

"Sire,—Si le monde parloit ici à la place de Jesus Christ, sans doute il ne tiendrait pas à votre Majesté le même langage.

MORRIS.

"Blessed are they that weep, for they shall be comforted."

Matt. v. 5.

"Sire,—Were the world here to address you, instead of Jesus Christ, it would doubtless adopt a different language to your Majesty.

"Heureux le prince, vous dirait-il, qui n'a jamais combattu que pour vaincre ; qui n'a tant de puissances armées contre lui, que pour leur donner une paix glorieuse ; et qui a toujours été plus grand ou que le peril on que la victoire.

"Heureux le prince, qui durant le cours d'un regne long et flourishing, jouit à loisir des fruits de sa gloire, de l'amour de ses peuples, de l'estime de ses ennemis, de l'admiration de l'univers, de l'avantage de ses conquêtes, de la magnificence de ses ouvrages, de la sagesse de ses lois, de l'esperance auguste d'une nombreuse posterité ; et qui n'a plus rien à desirer, que de conserver long temps ce qu'il possède.

"Ainsi parleroit le monde ; mais, Sire, Jesus Christ ne parle pas comme le monde.

"Heureux, vous dit-il, non celui qui fait l'admiration de son siècle, mais celui qui fait sa principale occupation du siècle à venir, et qui vit dans le mépris de soi-même et de tout ce qui passe ; parce-que le royaume du ciel est à lui. '*Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum.*'—(*Matt. v. 3.*)

"Heureux, non celui dont l'histoire va immortaliser le règne et les actions dans le souvenir des hommes, mais celui dont les larmes auront effacé l'histoire de ses péchés du souvenir de Dieu même ; parce qu'il sera éternellement consolé. '*Beati qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.*'—(*Matt. v. 5.*)

"Heureux, non celui qui aura étendu par de nouvelles conquêtes les bornes de son Empire, mais celui qui aura su renfermer ses desirs et ses passions dans les bornes de la loi de Dieu ; parce qu'il possédera une terre plus durable que l'empire de l'univers. '*Beati mites, quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram.*'—(*Matt. v. 4.*)

"Heureux, non celui qui élevé par le voix des peuple au dessus de tous les princes, qui l'ont précédé, jouit à loisir de sa grandeur et de sa gloire, mais celui qui, ne trouvant

"Happy, it would say, is the Prince who has never fought but to conquer, who has seen numerous powers armed against him, only that he might confer upon them a more honourable peace ; and who has always been superior both to danger and to victory.

"Happy the prince, who, during a long and prosperous reign, enjoys, at his leisure, the fruits of his glory, the love of his people, the esteem of his enemies, the admiration of the world, the benefit of his conquests, the splendour of his works, the wisdom of his laws, and the pleasing hope of a numerous posterity ; and who has nothing left to desire, but the long enjoyment of what he possesses.

"Thus would the world address you ; but, Sire, Jesus Christ does not speak the language of the world.

"Jesus says, happy is he—not who is the admiration of his age—but he who makes the world to come his chief concern ; who lives in the contempt of himself and of every thing transitory, because the kingdom of God is his. '*Blessed are the poor in spirit, for their's is the kingdom of heaven.*'

"Happy is he—not whose reign and actions will be immortalized by history in the remembrance of men—but he whose tears have effaced his transgressions from the remembrance of God, because he will be eternally consoled. '*Blessed are they that weep, for they shall be comforted.*'

"Happy is he—not who has extended the limits of his empire by new conquests—but he who has confined his desires and his passions within the limits of the law of God, because he will possess a land more durable than the empire of the universe. '*Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.*'

"Happy is he—not who is exalted by the voice of the people above all the princes who have preceded him—but he, who finding nothing in a throne worthy of affection, ceases

rien, sur le frône même digné de son cœur, ne cherche de parfait bonheur ici bas que dans la vertu et dans la justice ; parcequ'il sera rassasié. 'Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam quoniam ipsi saturabuntur.'—(*Matt. v. 6.*)

"Heureux, non celui à qui les hommes ont donné les titres glorieux de grand et d'invincible, mais celui à qui les mal heureux donneront devant Jésus Christ le titre de père et de miséricordieux, parcequ'il sera traité avec miséricorde. 'Beati misericordes, quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur!'"—(*Matt. v. 7.*)

"Heureux, enfin, non celui qui, toujours arbitre de la destinée de ses ennemis, a donné plus d'une fois la paix à la terre, mais celui qui a pu se la donner à soi même, et bantir de son cœur les vices et les affections déréglées qui en troublent la tranquillité ; parce qu'il sera appelé enfant de Dieu. 'Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur.'—(*Matt. v. 9.*)

to seek for perfect happiness in this life, except in the practice of virtue and justice : for he shall be satisfied. 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.'

"Happy is he—not upon whom men have conferred the glorious titles of great and invincible—but he, upon whom the miserable will bestow the title of a father or of a benefactor. 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.'

"Finally, happy is he—not who has always been the arbiter of the fate of his enemies, and who has, more than once, given peace to the world—but he, who has been able to confer it upon himself, and to banish from his heart the vices, and the disordered affections which disturbed his tranquillity : for he shall be called a child of God. 'Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the sons of God.'

"Such, Sire, are the persons whom Jesus Christ pronounces happy ; and the Gospel knows no happiness upon earth but that which results from virtue and innocence."

In 1704, when Massillon concluded a course of sermons before Louis XIV., that monarch addressed him publicly in these terms :—"J'ai entendu dans ma chapelle plusieurs prédicateurs dont j'ai été très satisfait ; mais en vous écoutant j'ai été mecontent de moi-même. Je veux vous entendre désormais tous les deux ans." Jealousy and intrigue are said to have frustrated the design of Louis ; and during the remaining years of his reign the voice of Massillon was not heard within the walls of Versailles. He was to re-appear at Paris under circumstances of peculiar interest. Louis XIV. terminated his career of glory and shame, and was succeeded by a child. Before this boy-monarch Massillon was appointed to deliver a course of lectures in 1717. This was the origin of the *Petit Carême*—a work by which his name has been promulgated to foreign nations, and hallowed with perpetual respect. In the same year he was elected into the French Academy ; and Fleury, in his address of reception, by a metaphor sufficiently presumptuous, compares his awakening appeals, to the life which the Hebrew prophet breathed into the dead child of the Shunamite. But the *Petit Carême*, notwithstanding the applause of Voltaire, and the fame that united it to the discourse of Bossuet, and the

Telemachus of Fenelon, has not gone through the ordeal of criticism without injury. Maury regards it as the feeblest of Massillon's productions—some, with the exception of his *Eloges* and *Panegyriques*. The author himself appears, notwithstanding the labour devoted to its composition, never to have anticipated that enthusiasm of praise which welcomed the *Petit Carême*. He prefixed "*un avis au Lecteur*," in which he styles the series of discourses "*Entretiens particuliers*," for the instruction of the young King and his court, who constituted the audience in the Chapel of the Chateau of the Tuilleries. The autograph manuscript is now preserved in the Royal Library of Paris, as we are told by Quérard, in the fifth volume of his *France Littéraire*.

The *Petit Carême* is a manual for kings, if not the most powerful, certainly the most graceful, ever offered to them. The nature of their duties, the temptations of their rank, the punishment of their crimes, are treated with a melody of language whose very fault resides in its softness. Massillon was not insensible to the stumbling-blocks that lay in the path of the Christian orator. He has alluded to them in his thoughts "*des Predicateurs*." They entertain, he says, too great a respect for customs consecrated by time and by fashion; they hesitate to denounce a particular vice, lest their censure should appear to be aimed at a particular individual. They satisfy themselves with offering a distant glimpse of sins, which they ought to hold up before the eyes of the congregation. The eulogist usurps the seat of the remonstrant, and the appeal of indignation melts into the music of praise. Where the Gospel demands an anathema, flattery gives an eulogy. Assuredly Massillon was not often guilty of this error. He ascended the pulpit, not arrayed in the haughty dignity of Bossuet; he did not proclaim the absolute power of kings, or the resistless domination of the priesthood: he neither bound his audience to the chariot wheels of the monarchy, nor of the Church—he associated the government of the prince with the liberty of the people. While he acknowledged the nobility of rank, the dignity of fortune, and the splendour of genius, he declared that God would lay upon the head of licentious wealth the crimes of poverty; that the greatest warrior was the man who vanquished himself; and that the brightest talents became only splendid vices, unless employed to promote the welfare of the community. "*On a vu*," is his own exclamation, "*plus d'une fois les pierres même les plus brillantes du sanctuaire s'avilir et se trainer indignement, &c.*" He would have been one of the most unfortunate of men, if he had thus fallen under the thunderbolt which he hurled with so fearless a hand. His

life discountenanced the calumny; he seems to have been uninjured by the intoxication of flattery, and to have retired to the seclusion of his diocese with a single and pious heart. When a friend congratulated him upon the success of his preaching, he answered "The devil has already told me so with a tongue more eloquent than yours."

Flechier has been called the Racine of the Pulpit. But we think that Massillon has an equal claim to the appellation. His purity of language is not inferior, and the charm of his manner is even more graceful. In both writers we behold the exquisite fitness of diction; they lived when the language had reached its full maturity of blossom and fruit. The fine writers under Louis XIV., is the observation of Bishop Hurd, were every day advancing the French language such as it is (simple, clear, exact, that is, fit for business and conversation) towards its last stage of perfection. The purity of the ancient manner, he continues, became well understood, and it was the pride of their best critics to expose every instance of false taste in the modern writers. The genius of French literature appeared under its most alluring form upon the stage; and that rhythmical harmony which delights the ear in the theatre, was sought for, nor was it sought in vain, even within the consecrated precincts of the Church.

Even the *Petit Carême* may be honoured by being associated with the most delightful of French drama. The merit of retaining the unbroken sympathy of the reader during five acts, with the interest of a priest and a child, belongs to the author of *Athalie*. The drama is recommended by none of the common and seductive machinery of the stage. But the style never sinks into feebleness; the versification, like an elaborate composition, played by some great master, never jars in a single note. A constant warmth of sensibility pervades the remotest members. These were the qualities that induced Boileau to pronounce it the best work of the author, and Voltaire to break into a rapture of applause at the recitation of *Le Kain*. But *Athalie* teaches another lesson to the poet, and a lesson of wisdom and consolation. This tragedy, so full of beauty, so alive with pathos, so touching in its tone, was almost hooted out of the literature of France; one of the pleasantest punishments, inflicted in the fashionable circles of Paris, was the perusal of a given number of lines from *Athalie*. Even Arnauld, the gifted friend of Racine, considered it inferior to *Esther*. It has long since taken its appropriate place in the treasury of beautiful productions, of which Fame keeps the key—in the memory of the world. It is mentioned with the noblest and most lasting creations of the human intellect, and will continue to live

with Euripides, with Shakespeare, and with Ford. Nor is it a slight gratification to the Christian heart to remember that this flame of reputation was lighted at the altar of Virtue; that the odour of fancy and delight arose from sacred incense.

In the continuity of his thoughts and the harmonious unity of his images, Massillon has been surpassed only by our own truly venerable and apostolic Leighton. How admirable is the metaphorical description of prophecy—how musical, how unbroken. “This sweet stream of their doctrine did, as the rivers, make its own banks fertile and pleasant as it ran by, and flowed still forward to after ages, and by the confluence of more such prophecies grew greater as it went, till it fell in with the main current of the Gospel in the New Testament; both acted and preached by the great Prophet himself, whom they foretold to come, and recorded by his Apostles and Evangelists, and thus united into one river, clear as crystal. This doctrine of salvation in the Scriptures hath still refreshed the city of God, his Church under the Gospel; and still shall do so until it empty itself into the ocean of eternity.” Upon this metaphor Coleridge observes that in the entire course of his studies he never remembered to have read so beautiful an allegory; so various in detail and yet so just in sentiment, and so natural in imagery. It may not be inexpedient to offer another specimen of unbroken metaphor from the same inimitable writer. It is founded upon a comparison equally familiar. “As in religion,” he says, “so in the course and practise of men’s lives, the stream of sin runs from one age to another, and every age makes it greater, adding somewhat to what it receives, as rivers grow in their course by the accession of brooks that fall into them; and every man, when he is born, falls like a drop into the main current of corruption, and so is carried down it, and this by reason of its strength and his own nature, which willingly dissolves into it and runs along with it.” It was with perfect truth that the same critic affirmed of this passage, that it presents the union of religion, philosophy, and poetry; and that Plato seems to be glorified by St. Paul.

Of these three illustrious preachers whom shall we prefer: to which is the crown of eloquence to be awarded? We are not of course referring to their doctrine, for *there* doubt ceases to have any place: and the elaborate jesuitism of Bourdaloue, and the harmonious sophistry of Massillon, are almost extinguished by the clear and illuminating faith of Barrow. They looked upon Christianity through a glass which the cunning finger of tradition had painted, and every object assumed, in a greater or less degree, the deception of those colours. The tints, indeed, are often beautiful, even when they are most de-

lusive. But when we contemplate these eminent persons only on the side of eloquence, the eye is instantly drawn and detained by the commanding stature and serene physiognomy of Barrow. Never has the sepulchre of Christ been guarded by a more majestic centinel; never has a brighter or a keener sword repelled the foot of the apostate from the garden of sacred truth; never has a richer or a mightier voice cheered the fainting spirit of the Christian soldier. The sermons of Barrow are the glory of our Church. Taylor had more imagination—Hall had more fancy—but Barrow had most vigour. His flexible argument, woven of links of adamant, not only encircles but crushes an antagonist. It has vitality in every fold. Yet, tremendous as are its powers, nothing can be easier than its movements. His most surprising exhibitions of strength cost him no effort. He can balance himself upon the most perilous edges of metaphysical disquisition, and look down with an eye that never quails into the blackest depths of human nature. Of all our writers his logic is the most clear, the most vivacious. When we call Barrow a logical writer, it is desirable to explain what we understand by the term. Now the word logic, as Dugald Stewart has shewn, is employed by modern writers in two very different senses. By some it is used to express the scholastic art of syllogising, and by others to explain “that branch of the philosophy of the human mind which has for its object to guard us against the various errors to which we are liable in the exercise of our reasoning powers, and to assist and direct the inventive faculty in the investigation of truth.” The aim and intention of both descriptions of logic are the same; but the justness of their principles differs widely. Logic is, then, simply and emphatically the art of reasoning, or the deduction of certain conclusions from given or assumed premises. The logic of Barrow, however, is not the technical logic of the schools; it is a scheme of argument constructed by that most skilful of mechanicians—*common sense*. In his volume we always see common sense governing by a *definite system of laws*.

We have admitted Barrow to be inferior to Taylor in imagination, and to Hall in fancy. Those softer rays of invention, those glistenings of thought, which constitute the charm of poetry he certainly did not possess. If he borrowed anything from Ovid, it was only *conceits*. But if he had *less* imagination, we do not say that he had *none*. He had much; and imagination, moreover, of an order related to the Epic grandeur of Milton, or the sterner delineations of Dante. Among English authors Donne seems to offer many analogies. That sublime writer of *prose* might have startled his congregation at St. Dun-

stan's with this passage upon the sufferings of the Redeemer : " The sight of God's indignation, so dreadfully flaming out against sin, might well astonish and terrify him ; to stand, as it were, before the mouth of hell, belching out fire and brimstone in his face ; to lie down in the hottest furnace of divine vengeance ; to quench with his own heart-blood the wrath of heaven, and the infernal fire (as he did in regard to those who will not rekindle them to themselves), might well, in the heart of a man, beget unconceivable and unexpressible pressures of affliction." This may be considered only as an example of his striking and vivid representations of thought ; but his claim to sway the mind of the reader is never, we think, so perfectly asserted and maintained, as in those more usual trains of condensed arguments and metaphor which may be considered to form his natural style. Let us turn, only for a single minute, to his remarks upon the Apostolical testimony to the truth of our Lord's resurrection. " It had no power to sustain it, so it used no sleight to convey itself into the persuasions of men ; it did not creep in dark corners ; it did not grow by clandestine whispers ; it craved no blind faith of men ; but with a bare-faced confidence it openly proclaimed itself, appealing to the common sense of men, and provoking the world to examine it ; daring all adversaries here to confront it, defying all the powers beneath to withstand it, claiming only the patronage of heaven to maintain it." How vividly do we feel, while reading these nervous and simple sentences, the truth of the line in Horace—that a familiar acquaintance with the subject will ensure the required expressions—

" cui lecta potenter erit res,

Nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo."

Such a writer sinks and rises with his theme : now clear and persuasive, now eager and imperative, now vehement and passionate. It is only the Nero of eloquence who gilds the statues of Lysippus. We find in the sermons of Barrow fewer *unserviceable* epithets—mere expletives—than in any other writer of his time. He has no *complements*, if we may employ the phrase, to make up his *figures*. He remembered, doubtlessly, the saying of the great master of eloquence, "*Apud oratorem vero nisi aliquid efficitur, redundat ;*" and who immediately furnished us with the means of discovering this redundancy : "*tum autem efficitur si sine illo quod dicitur, minus est.*" Let it not be thought that, in these observations, we are attempting to depress the reputation of Taylor or of Hall. No language can adequately realize our love, our veneration for them both. Time will be no more, when Fame

forgets to renew the inscription upon their tombs. To them belong, pre-eminently, the fountains of consolation; to their hands seems to be entrusted, with peculiar abundance, the Balm of Gilead. Whenever the traveller in his journey through life falls among thieves, or becomes the victim of some sad calamity, it is to them—as to the *temporal* physicians of the soul—that he most frequently turns for wine and oil. What voices, except the holy spirit of inspiration, breathe a sweeter repose over the house of mourning? How full of kind admonition, of touching expostulation, of tenderest sympathy. We turn to drink at their streams of wisdom, and find them always fed from the brook of Sion. They were, moreover, among the earliest architects of our language; they raised the first temples of sacred eloquence. To each of them may we exclaim, with infinitely greater truth than Lucretius said of the philosophy of Epicurus, or a modern flatterer of the poetry of Waller:—

“Tu Pater et rerum inventor; Tu patria nobis
Suppeditas præcepta; tuisque ex, Inclyte, chartis,
Floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant,
Omnia nos itidem depascimur aurea dicta;
Aurea! perpetuâ semper dignissima vitâ.”

Yet it cannot be denied that Taylor and Hall are occasionally overcome by the tide of inspiration. The remark applies especially to the first. It was said of Dryden, by his most eminent biographer, that he delighted in wild and daring sallies of sentiment, in the irregular and eccentric violence of wit; that he was fond of hanging over the very “brink of meaning,” and that he sometimes approached even to the “precipice of absurdity.” We know not that these resounding sentences can, with perfect aptitude, be transferred to Taylor; and yet there may, without doubt, be found in his voluminous works many passages in which the object of the writer is somewhat clouded by the superfluity of ornament; where a thought is weighed down by its costly drapery; carried away by the joyfulness of his heart, this bird of Paradise seems to sing out of our sight, and to confuse us by the very luxury of his music. From these perplexing circles of fancy, the severer discipline of Barrow usually preserved him; although he may indulge in a few embellishments of the theme. Boileau has asserted that a cold author is always detestable; and we think so too. But that glow of language, which the French call *la chaleur du style*, should proceed from a healthy and vigorous circulation of the mental blood. In many writers it is the heat of a fever. Never, then,—let us say to the youthful student of theology—never, we beseech you, forget the name of Barrow. We would urge this devotion upon him in the language of a most eloquent

admirer, who beholds in Barrow "the greatest man of our Church, the express image of her doctrines and spirit, the model without a fault, a perfect master of the art of reasoning, yet aware of the limits to which reason should be confined; now wielding it with the authority of an angel, and now again stooping it before the deep things of God with the humility of a child; alike removed from the puritan of his own generation, and the rationalist of the generation which succeeded him; no precisian or latitudinarian; full of faith, yet free from superstition; a steadfast believer in a particular Providence, in the efficacy of human prayers, in the active influence of God's spirit, but without one touch of the visionary; conscious of the deep corruption of our nature, though still thinking he could discover in it some traces of God's image in ruins; and under a lively sense of the consequences of his corruption, casting himself altogether upon God's mercy through the sufferings of a Saviour, for the consummation of that day which he desired to attain unto, when his mind purged and his eye clear, he should be permitted to behold and understand without the labour and intervention of slow and successive thought, not this our system alone, but more and more excellent things than this."

To this glowing eulogy what shall we add? A word of caution, perhaps, against the ardour of its praise—but we rather abstain. In those fields of eloquence and learning the reader cannot begin to wander too soon, nor can he wander there too long; and even though the service of the altar may not demand of him familiar acquaintance with the eloquence of the pulpit, yet in every situation in life the practical wisdom of Barrow will be more useful to him, than the sweetest strain of philosophy that ever sounded in the Academy or the Porch. The copiousness of Barrow is almost unrivalled: and it is always genuine and always pure; but copious as he is, he is rarely diffuse. Sometimes, indeed, we are tempted to cry out of him, as of other famous men, *Si ingenio temperare quàm indulgere maluisset, quid vir iste præstare non potuisset!* But the feeling of disappointment subsides at the next word that falls from his lips. Once more, then—hail, and farewell! What we have said has been uttered in a spirit of love and sincerity. The writer of these pages may take to himself the words of Parr, in his character of Warburton, and say that he praises Barrow from no vain and presumptuous confidence in his own abilities, but in obedience to the fervent impulses of his own mind—a mind which that illustrious man, in the language of Parr, has enlightened, enchanted, and improved:—

"His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere."

ART. VI.—*The State of Religion and Education in New South Wales.* By WILLIAM WESTBROOKE BURTON, Esq., One of the Judges of the Supreme Court in the Colony. London: Cross; and Simpkin and Marshall. 1840.

THIS is a valuable and well-timed publication. The station of the author, his opportunities of obtaining information, his manifest impartiality, and his freedom from anything like party prejudices or party purposes, concur in rendering his work one of the most trustworthy which we have seen. Mr. Justice Burton writes as a man who is desirous of telling the whole truth and nothing but the truth, be the consequences what they may, or light the condemnation on what it will. His language is remarkable for its simplicity, and the absence of meretricious ornament and “ad captandum” phrases to stir the feelings and work on the prepossessions of his readers. He writes not for effect; his sole object appears to be to lay before the public a correct statement of the religious condition of the colony in which he has exercised the functions of a judge for a period of six years. His work is not, in the common sense of the word, a *popular* one—it will not interest that numerous class of readers to whom thought is irksome and reflection unknown. We could, indeed, almost have wished that he had spared us in some instances the minuteness of detail in which he enters: but when we consider the nature of his object, and how desirable it is that every statement which is made should be clearly substantiated, we feel that Mr. Burton has pursued the most fitting course, and that his fullness and particularity on every point form one of the main excellencies of his work. We rise from its perusal with the conviction that we have the whole case before us, and that we are able to form a correct judgment upon the state of religion and education in New South Wales, without having recourse to any other quarter.

The colony of New South Wales comes under our notice in a peculiar point of view. Founded about fifty-two years ago with the principal, if not sole, object of receiving our convict population, and affording them an opportunity of regaining, in a distant land, the character which their crimes had forfeited in this country, we should have imagined that the benevolent devisers of the scheme would have made religion the basis of their plan, and not have looked for the reformation of the criminal, without providing him with the means whereby that reformation could be most surely worked out. We are far from saying that this consideration did not, to a certain extent, enter

into their design: but that it was not the foundation of the system, the whole history of the colony up to the present moment clearly proves. It was by the merest accident that the first expedition did not sail without a minister of religion.

This extraordinary circumstance must probably be regarded as an oversight on the part of those who were engaged in carrying into effect the objects of the Government. It was still a singular omission, and shows conclusively that religion was not in all the thoughts of its projectors. The first settlers, including nearly seven hundred convicts, amounted to more than one thousand persons. The territory was taken possession of and the British standard erected with the customary honours. Mr. Burton makes some pious and appropriate reflections on the solemnities of *that* day, of which religious worship seems to have formed *no* part.

“For six years the clergyman had to celebrate divine worship in the open air, subject to all the disadvantages and interruptions consequent upon such an arrangement in a changeable climate; at length he built a temporary place of worship at his own expence, which was opened for divine service on the 25th of August, 1795.” p. 6.

“In 1794, the population had been increased by the addition of a few free settlers, with their families, and upwards of 4,000 convicts; and in March of that year the Rev. Samuel Marsden arrived in the colony, and divided with Mr. Johnston the labours of the ministry until the year 1800, when Mr. Johnston quitted the colony, and its spiritual concerns were again left under the superintendence of one Clergyman for seven years more of its infant state.” p. 6.

The colony went on increasing. In 1810 the population amounted to 10,452 souls; in 1817 to 17,214, of whom 6,777 were convicts. During this interval *one* chaplain was added to the establishment. Between 1818 and 1824 the number of chaplains remained the same.

“There must also be noted the indifference of those in authority to religious matters, so remarkable in the single fact, that one of the earliest Governors had to be informed by the clergyman, that five or six persons only attended divine service; and that it was then that he determined to go to church himself, and stated that ‘he expected that his example would be followed by the people.’” p. 10.

“Notwithstanding urgent and frequent appeals to every quarter for increased spiritual means, this state of things continued with so little alleviation, that in September, 1833, (the population then amounting to 60,794 souls, of whom 16,151 were convicts, 43,095 being Protestants and 17,238 Roman Catholics), his Excellency the Governor, in representing the religious means of the community to the Right Honourable the Secretary for the Colonies, could only enumerate ‘an archdeacon, fifteen chaplains, and four catechists, as belonging to the Church of

England ; and that with respect to places of worship, the Church of England possessed at that time in Sydney, and within forty miles of it, seven stone or brick churches of moderate size and respectable appearance, besides two others of the same description in more remote parts of the colony, and several less permanent buildings in various places."

The foregoing statements will show the difficulties with which the clergy had to contend, and the parsimoniousness with which religious means were grudged to the colony. Entreaties and remonstrances seem alike to have been disregarded : and religious instructors were doled out to the population—a scattered, convict, and for the most part an adult population—in just sufficient numbers to take away the stigma that religion was wholly uncared for, but not in sufficient numbers to bring the great mass of the people under the influence of religious principles and feelings.

In 1833 the working of another, we wish that we could add a better, order of things is found in active operation. Care for the religious culture of the people seems no longer to have been unheeded ; a religious impulse of some kind makes itself felt in high places : and that impulse produces, as its effect, a considerable addition to the religious means of New South Wales. In a word, the spirit of popery traverses the Pacific, and erects its idolatrous standard on the shores of Australia. An immediate stop is put to the increase of the clergy of the Church ; though, as it were, to counteract in some measure the evils of Romanism, Presbyterianism and Dissent are encouraged, and advance *pari passu* to influence and power. "The Church of England (says Mr. Burton), as to the number of its clergymen, continued the same in 1837 as it was in 1829, the *population having in the meanwhile been doubled.*" But not so with the rival and now favoured establishment of Scotland and of Rome.

"Meanwhile, however, provision was made in the estimates thus referred to, as stated by the governor, for 'considerable additions to the ministers of the Scotch Church and to the Roman Catholic clergy.'

"The estimate for those of the former communion being one-third in amount greater for 1833 than it had been in the previous year, and for those of the latter more than double ; whilst provision was made in the estimate for 1834 for four ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, and for a Roman Catholic vicar-general and six Roman Catholic chaplains ; and the amount for Roman Catholic schools was increased fourfold ; in the estimate for 1835, provision was made for the same number of Presbyterian clergy and Roman Catholic clergy ; and in the estimate for 1836, provision was made for eight ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, and for a Bishop of the Church of Rome, a vicar-general and six Roman Catholic chaplains ; whilst no addition was made to the number of the clergymen of

*the Church of England until the year 1837, and none authorised and recommended by the governor of the colony until after the passing of the new act, viz., in November 1836; and in England that circumstance took place which was noticed in the report of the Diocesan Committee before referred to, viz., the return of the Bishop of Australia to his charge in 1836, without an additional clergyman; 'which was owing (state the committee) to the refusal of his Majesty's Government to sanction any allowance towards the expense of the passage, or procuring a residence or means of support for any additional clergyman.'** From these circumstances, it would indeed almost appear as if it had been the intention, if not the recommendation, of the Colonial Government not to increase the establishment of the Church of England until each of these other churches should have arrived at an equality with it in every respect. Each was considerably advanced towards that equality, but especially the Roman Catholic, before the plan of the Colonial Government for the future ecclesiastical establishment was promulgated in the colony. In the estimates for 1834 and 1835, the clergymen of the Church of England only exceeded the numbers of the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian clergy together, by four; in the estimates for 1836, their united numbers were actually equal to those of the Church of England; and they possessed an advantage over the latter in the fact, that the newly-introduced clergymen of both churches were younger men, and in the case of the Roman Catholics under the jurisdiction of a Bishop."

Not only was the Church of England thus impeded in her progress by the neglect of the Government, but "a heavy blow and great discouragement" was actually aimed against her existence by those who ought to have upheld her by every means in their power. Carrying out the designs of the Government which founded the colony, and made provision for the assignment of four hundred acres for a glebe, and two hundred acres for a school in every township, the Ministers of the Crown, in the year 1826, advised his Majesty King George IV. to erect into a corporation the leading officers of the colony, together with the Archdeacon and a certain number of chaplains; and vested in them all the lands set apart in the colony, for the purposes of education, and for the maintenance of the clergy; and, likewise, enjoined the governor—

"To set apart in each and every county, hundred, &c. into which the colony might be divided, a tract of land comprising one-seventh part in extent and value of all the lands in each and every such county, to be thenceforward called and known by the name of the clergy and school estates of such county, and the governor was directed to make to the corporation grants thereof."

The Ecclesiastical Corporation thus formed was admirably

* Report of the Diocesan Committee of the Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and for Promoting Christian Knowledge, for 1837.

calculated to answer the purposes designed in the royal charter. Had the provisions of the charter been *honestly* carried into effect, at this moment the religious condition of the colony, as to the efficiency of the establishment, would have resembled that of our own country. In every township there would have been a minister of the Gospel, with a fair, though not inadequate remuneration, independent for the means of support of those among whom he ministered, doing his duty zealously and fearlessly, and diffusing around him the blessings of the Gospel. There would have been likewise a school, in which the young would have been religiously trained in the sound principles of Christianity taught by our Church. The colonial treasury would have been relieved of a considerable annual payment; and, without taxing one single individual, ample revenues would have been provided for the Church—revenues increasing with the increased population, and enabling the spirit of religion and the spirit of worldly enterprise, to go hand in hand into the wastes of Australia. Such a picture, however, it did not suit the enemies of the Church to contemplate with pleasure. Accordingly, every obstacle was thrown in the way of the corporation; the lands which were theirs by royal charter were studiously withheld, or when granted, were studiously allotted in the worst situations, and the least available for agricultural purposes. It is notorious that not one-seventh in quantity, much less in value, was at any time assigned them.

But though thus deprived of that power which the royal bounty had made, on the corporation was thrown the whole expense of maintaining the existing clergy and schools. With an honest determination of purpose to fulfil the trust confided to them, the trustees were induced to sell a portion of the glebes which had been assigned to the clergy some years before; they thus, unwisely we think, sacrificed the future to the present, and the result has been that the Church has been despoiled of that which was hers of undoubted right.

While struggling with difficulties such as these, and every day more and more surmounting them by an unwearied perseverance—seeing more clearly the probability of effecting the objects for which they were incorporated, without intimation of any kind that their proceedings were disapproved of by the Government at home—the trustees suddenly received a notice that their functions were to cease, that the charter was to be revoked, and that their lands and property were to revert to the Crown. This revocation of the charter took place while Sir George Murray was Secretary for the Colonies; and we believe it is the boast of Dr.

Lang, a Presbyterian clergyman, that by his meddling interference the act of revocation was effected.

The folly of this act of the Government is only to be exceeded by its iniquity. On the faith of the charter, many persons had given money, flocks, and herds, to the corporation: they were now all swept away into the colonial treasury; or rather, we should say, a considerable proportion put into the pocket of the government collector.

“It was an object of the corporation, by the quiet and unexpensive increase of these, to create a revenue in aid of their other assets: and there is no doubt that, under similar management, they would have become as profitable to them, as similar stock was at the same period to other proprietors in the colony. It was the interest of the agent, however, by a speedy sale, to increase the amount of the per centage, upon which his emoluments mainly depended; and this he proceeded to do in a mode which shows him to have been fully impressed with the value of turning them into money; and they were all disposed of by public auction between the 1st of January, 1834, and the 28th of March, 1837, the wool and stock together having realised, between these dates, the sum of not less than . . . £16,539 10 8½

“The proceeds collected by him between these
dates, and for rents of lands 4,279 11 5½

p. 40. “Amounting to not less than £20,819 2 2”

It is a singular circumstance in the whole proceeding that the charter was annulled without reference to the trustees, or any inquiry as to its working and efficiency. Secrecy seems to have been the policy of the Colonial Office; and the desire appears to have been, that no remonstrance should be offered, no information given, which might shake the purpose of the Colonial Secretary. We cannot acquit Sir George Murray in this instance of unfairness to the Church, and of yielding to the undue influence of its enemies.

“The notification of the Right Honourable Secretary of State’s (then Sir George Murray) counsel to his Majesty to revoke the letters patent by which the corporation had been created, ‘was conveyed to the Governor of New South Wales in a despatch dated 28th of May, 1829, (No. 213), and it is not a little remarkable that Archdeacon Broughton, who sailed from England the day after that despatch bore date, having been, on the resignation of Archdeacon Scott, appointed Archdeacon of New South Wales, and, as such, vice-president of the corporation, and having been in constant communication with the Colonial Office during the four preceding months, left England in entire ignorance of the existence of any intention to revoke the charter. He arrived in New South Wales on the 15th of September in the same year, and immediately entered upon his duties as vice-president of the

corporation ; and on the 4th of December, the tenor of the above dispatch, suspending the further proceedings of the corporation, was communicated." p. 38.

Well, the enemies of the Church having succeeded thus far ; first in stopping the supply of clergymen, and then in robbing them of their property, speedily and vigorously followed up their victory. There was now no longer a colonial governor in whose breast the welfare of the Church was a predominant feeling : Governor Darling had fulfilled his term, and had been succeeded by Governor Bourke. The charter had contained a clause which empowered its revocation. So far the proceeding was legal, though it was not just. The next attack upon the Church had not, however, this poor excuse to cover its glaring injustice—it was as illegal as it was inexpedient. It was no less than the attempt to deprive the Church of England of her supremacy, and by a local act of the Governor and Council of New South Wales to do that which it is hardly competent for the Imperial Legislature to do ! It was, to use the words of Mr. Burton, "a revolution in the constitutional principles on which the colony of New South Wales had been founded." Mr. Burton argues the case clearly and convincingly ; he fully demonstrates that the Church was by law the Established Church of New South Wales, and could not be other than the Established Church of that colony except by an act of the Imperial Parliament.

There can be no doubt whatever that the Church of England was by law the Established Church of New South Wales, and that notwithstanding Sir Richard Bourke's local act, she still continues so ; and that, consequently, when between Lord Glenelg and Sir Richard Bourke the transaction which we are about to detail took place, they were guilty of an unconstitutional exercise of the authority vested in them. As regards Sir Richard Bourke, it is impossible not to observe a rancorous hostility to the Church and Clergy of the Church of England ; from the general tenor of his dispatch, as well as from particular passages of it, we see a spirit at work internally, and an influence pressing him externally, essentially hostile to the Church. We regret to say that the evidence on which he rests his case in his statement to Lord Glenelg is *made* for the occasion. He alleges a general complaint as existing against the Church of England in the colony, and talks of a petition which has been presented to him, emanating from a public meeting, numerously signed. Now what is the inference which Sir Richard wished Lord Glenelg to draw from hence ? Why that it would be a popular act in the colony to overthrow the Established Church ! And that public opinion in New South Wales was so adverse to the continuance of the

Church, that public meetings were being held, and that agitation and excitement were rife upon the subject. Sir Richard concealed from the Secretary of State *the facts that the petition (and the meeting from which it proceeded) was got up by his own partizans for this specific purpose*; that though it might be numerous, it was not *respectably* signed; that on the contrary, with a very few exceptions, no respectable man in Sydney had signed it; but that the *scum and refuse of a convict population*, and those who favoured their most unwarrantable pretensions, AMONG WHOM Sir Richard was at that moment seeking his popularity, were the persons by whom, and *by whom alone*, the complaint, which he represents as “general,” was made. The petition and the signatures Sir Richard did not *dare* to lay before the council; no inquiry was made into the truth of its allegations; and yet he uses it as an argument with the Secretary of State in favour of his new scheme for placing all religions, true or false, on the same footing! And had the petition emanated from the respectable classes in Sydney, had it been as respectably signed as notoriously it was otherwise, what a ground for a legislator to found his acts upon? Mere popular feeling, the clamour of the moment, an interested clamour, got up for a party purpose! Lord Stanley, who preceded Lord Glenelg in the Colonial Office, treated Sir Richard and his dispatch as they deserved, with silent but marked contempt. For two whole years it lay unnoticed in the archives of the Colonial Office. At length, however, the hour arrived for its re-production into light. Voluntaryism in religion was rampantly exhibiting itself in England, and the time was propitious for Government to manifest to their *friends and supporters*, that though they acknowledged the preamble to be good, they could not yet carry it out at home, but that in the colonies they were willing to give it a trial. We are quite sure that some intimation of the intention of Government was afforded to the Roman Catholics, for as soon as Sir Richard Bourke’s local act was passed they were prepared to take immediate advantage of its provisions; while, on the other hand, the Church of England had to await an interval of many months before steps could be taken with the same view. It is amusing, in the correspondence between Sir Richard Bourke and Lord Glenelg, to observe the tone of congratulation and self-satisfaction which pervades both parties. They laud themselves on anticipation of the excellency and wisdom of their plan and seem to think that their names would be handed down to posterity as having first broken through the trammels of prejudice in favour of an Established Church, and laid the foundation of religion in New South Wales on the

safe principles of voluntarism. A compunctious feeling does appear to have visited Lord Glenelg when he reflected that he, his colleagues, and above all his royal master, were still, *in principle*, members of the Church of England; and he puts in some words expressive of his desire that that Church may continue to meet with the greatest proportion of public favour; but the measure which he was at the time promoting was so manifestly against her welfare, that we may regard his affected attachment as adding insult to injury. We have not space for the correspondence. It is to be found entire in the appendix to Mr. Burton's work, and admirably commented upon in the body of the book. We cannot envy the feelings either of Sir Richard Bourke or of Lord Glenelg as they read Mr. Justice Burton's calm and temperate, though striking exposure of their traitorous proceedings.

The principle of the measure thus proposed was to extend equal support to "the three grand divisions of Christianity," viz., the "Churches of England, Scotland, and Rome;" in other words, to establish three churches in the colony instead of one. But why were other communions excluded? Members of dissenting congregations pay their proportion of taxes, and therefore come within Sir Richard's money-principle of "providing the fund from which distribution is made." An unfair use is made of the numbers of the dissenters: so long as the Church of England is to be the object of attack they are ostentatiously paraded, but when the "equitable footing" principle comes to be applied, they are thrown overboard, as not belonging to any of "the *grand divisions of Christianity*."

"It was not *proposed* to extend equal support to any of those denominations of Protestants who dissent from the National Church, although these are equally within the pecuniary principle, since they were part of 'the colonists who provide the funds from which this distribution is made;' and these had surely a superior claim, upon every constitutional principle, to that of the Church of Rome, if the support of religious institutions were intended to be placed upon what is termed an 'equitable footing.' Religionists of all denominations are included as 'persons who provide the funds, but derive no support from their religious institutions;' as persons who at the public meeting pray for 'a reduction of the expenditure for the support of the Church of England,' as swelling the amount of the disproportion of the sums annually granted to the Church of England; but when a new distribution is to be made, it is remarkable that they are not included."—p. 54, 55.

What then is the notable scheme which is dignified by Lord Glenelg with the title of PUBLIC RELIGION, and which Sir

Richard Bourke somewhat humourously describes as "laying the foundations of the Christian religion in the young and rising colony" of New South Wales : in which young and rising colony, be it observed, there existed at the time an archdeacon and fifteen clergy of the Church of England, several ministers of the Church of Scotland, a vicar-general and six Roman Catholic priests, and Dissenting ministers of various denominations ! The scheme is simply this : the Church of England is no longer to be recognized as the Established Church, but is, together with the Kirk of Scotland and the Church of Rome, to depend for its support on the voluntary contributions of its members, aided in proportion to their numbers by grants from the Colonial treasury. The parochial arrangement which was contemplated by the founders of the colony, and expressly recognized in the royal charter, is at once superseded, and it is enacted—

"That wherever there are one hundred adults (convicts included) who shall sign a paper stating their desire to attend a church or chapel, towards the building of which not less than 200*l.* shall have been subscribed, the governor shall be empowered to advance from the colonial treasury an annual sum of 100*l.* for the maintenance of the minister ; if two hundred adults, 150*l.* yearly, and if five hundred, 200*l.*, which it is declared shall be the highest stipend to be issued from the colonial treasury towards the support of any one officiating minister of religion."—p. 56, 57.

The scheme itself is full of contradictions and blunders. In one clause religionists of all denominations are included ; in another, a limitation is made to members of "the three grand divisions ;" in a third, the will of the governor is to be taken for law, and he is empowered to alter or add to, or to modify its provisions, as he may think proper. It is evidently framed upon a most accommodating principle, so as to be applicable to any new circumstances of expediency as they may arise, and to fit any new class of sectarians which, springing up on the hot-bed of dissent, may become powerful enough to act upon the Government. We wish to direct attention particularly to that clause which gives "convicts" the privilege of signing the Minister's testimonials. It is a curious provision ; and at first sight strikes us as a covert ridicule of the whole affair—as a sly insinuation against religion itself. But there is design, and deep design, in the enactment. At the period when the Act was passed and for some time previously, Roman Catholic influence had been working principally on the colony ; the Government offices were being daily filled with members of that Church—the Attorney-General was of that persuasion—and they who watched the signs of the times were aware that Romanism was in the ascendant at

Government-house, and overshadowed Downing-street. The Act itself was passed with an especial object to the advancement of the Roman Catholic Church: but it happened that the members of that Church as yet had no hold on the property or respectability of the colony; they were to be found principally among the convicted felons. "The equitable footing" principle, therefore, would have entirely failed, had *free men only* been permitted to sign this certificate. Hence the anomaly in modern legislation of giving to persons *civily dead and morally hostile to religion* the right of exercising an influence on the most important matter connected with the well-being of a state—the national faith. The absurdity would be self-evident were the principle applied to any other branch of legislation. It is only when statesmen consider all religions equally true or equally false, that they suffer convicted felons to become the medium of providing for the community those religious means which *practically* they set at nought. We are far from thinking that religion ought not to be brought home to the convict; but it is the duty of the Government to provide it for *him*—not *his* duty to sit in judgment upon forms and creeds, and to exercise an influence either for or against the Established Church of the land.

Thus degraded from her position, reduced to the condition of a sect among sects, her ministers from habit, from feeling, from principle, unable to enter the field and canvass convicts for their votes, signatures, and good opinions, a vital blow, it was thought, was struck against the Church of England. But, alas! for the wisdom of the framers of unjust measures! Good sprang out of the evil, and the Church of England, cramped and confined by the previous neglect of Government, immediately manifested gratifying proofs that she was living in the affections of the great majority of the colonists. Aided in her objects by the munificence of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, her energies, directed by the zealous and judicious Bishop that Providence had allowed to preside over her in an eventful hour, she was enabled to testify to the world with how great injustice she had been treated by Sir Richard Bourke, when her crying entreaties for labourers in the vineyard of the Lord had been so repeatedly and cruelly disregarded. Churches and congregations appeared in every quarter of the colony, and the cry was—the universal cry of the Church—"More Clergymen." In 1833, the clergy amounted to sixteen; in 1839, to thirty-three; since increased to forty-one; and still the want is pressingly felt. "The simple fact that so many as forty-two churches had been subscribed for in various parts of the colony, and that

no less than four additional Churches are absolutely wanted in Sydney itself, for every one of which congregations are prepared, abundantly established the position," that the Church of England had not been fairly treated in the years preceding the passing of the Act.

These are gratifying circumstances; and, so far, causes of "fervent gratitude to Him who thus turned the hearts of men to His service," and the working out of his designs. It should, however, be borne in mind that—

"The good was not unattended with evil, in the more than equal supply of those who are regarded by every sincere Protestant as teaching for doctrines the traditions of men. It were an unwelcome task to give utterance to opinions in disparagement of that measure, if it were the necessary foundation of so much good as has undoubtedly ensued. A little reflection, however, will show that the good might have been produced by other means, whilst the evil is all its own." p. 61.

The rapid and sudden advance of Romanism in New South Wales must fill every sincere Protestant with feelings of apprehension and grief; and truly do we wish that it were not our duty to ascribe it all to the soi-disant Protestant Government of our country. We have abundant evidence in Mr. Justice Burton's book of "the palmy state" to which Sir Richard Bourke has advanced the Church of Rome.

"The principle of the support afforded by the Government to ministers of religion, which depends upon the number of signatures obtained by or on behalf of the particular minister, of persons expressing a desire to attend his church or chapel, is also highly favourable to the Roman Catholic clergy, as it admits of the signatures of convicts for this purpose, and by the subscription of one hundred adult persons, one hundred a year may be obtained from the treasury; by that of two hundred persons, one hundred and fifty pounds a year; and even if there be not so many as one hundred persons, one hundred pounds a year may be obtained for a clergyman. Either sum, it must be admitted, is not so inadequate a stipend for a Roman Catholic clergyman, who is necessarily by his vows without those natural ties which occasion the chief expense of a Protestant household, as it is for a Protestant.

"The clergy of the Church of Rome are, as may be expected, most forward to take advantage of all these circumstances in their favour; and it will not be a matter of surprise, if from among the ignorant, and especially the convicts, many professors of their religion are obtained. The influence of the "Sisters of Charity" over the female convicts confined in the factory (or penitentiary) at Parramatta, and which began to be strongly felt at the time the writer of these observations left the colony, may be expected to end in that result; and that their numerous illegitimate children will be baptized into the Church of Rome.

"Additional Roman Catholic churches are in progress of erection in

many parts of the colony, at Windsor, at Goulburn, at Yass, at the Tumut River, and on the Banks of the Murrumbidgee. For these purposes their funds are derived from other sources than the donations of their adherents in the colony.

"Very few of these are amongst its landed proprietors; but the Roman Catholic establishment derives, it is believed, no inconsiderable portion of its support from the zealous members of that Church out of the colony, and that not in the United Kingdom alone, but in other parts of the world."

As a specimen of the qualifications of the popish priests of Australia, the convict-elected voluntaries, we subjoin a letter written by one Father Brady, a brilliant emeralder, to a gentleman who had declined subscribing for a popish chapel. We present it to our readers precisely as it stands in the original, so far as regards orthography and punctuation; but for the sake of illustration we have printed a variety of words in italics, not underscored in the original:—

"Penrith June the 9th 1838.

"SIR,—Educated in france & having lived with men of good *feellings*, accustomed to observe the rules of Society. I was not a little surprised at the strange reception you gave me last Thursday when I *done* myself the *pleasure* to *waite* on you for your liberal subscription *two-wards* the erection of the R. C. Chapel at Penrith you might have perceived. the great reserve made in answering your unbecoming observations on account of the place and circumstances it was in your own house in presence of your *aimable* & respectable family I made a sacrifice of my own rather than hurt their *feellings* were I to answer you *ad rem* I always considered it a very unbecoming if not a very *presumptuous think* on the part of a Lay man to expatiate on the Bible in presence of a R C Clergyman who received a *special education* and a regular mission *ad hoc* as for the subscription *Sollicited* in behalf of the R C Servents under your *Controol* I think I have done my duty and an act of Justice and that you have been deficient in both by not Subscribing to the erection of a *plac* of worship for them.

"I have the Honor to be your obedt. and humble servant

"JO BRADY R C C"

Let our readers contrast the picture of the Popish Bishop, in his canonicals, surrounded by a train of priests and a band of soldiers, with the unostentatious manner in which the first Protestant Bishop landed in the colony, without pomp or parade, unattended by one single clergyman, and looked upon by the Government with undissembled coldness. Bishop Broughton, at the time he was in England, met with no favour from the Colonial Secretary: his urgent applications for an increase of the Established Church were treated with neglect—and wearied out by fruitless efforts he returned to the colony downcast and dispirited; and confiding alone in the Providence of God he

entered upon the discharge of his episcopal functions. But what was the first object which met Bishop Broughton's eye on his arrival? A Roman Catholic Bishop with a numerous train of popish priests and catechists, sisters of charity, &c. The Right Rev. Dr. Polding had been *advised*, doubtless, that it was expedient that he should appear in New South Wales as the *first* Bishop, and accordingly, while Bishop Broughton was in England urging his fruitless remonstrances at the Colonial Office, he took his departure for the colony. But he went not alone: at the very time that Bishop Broughton was refused assistance, Bishop Polding received it to the extent of his desire.

Can there remain any doubt, after these statements (and they are no more than a sample), that Romanism has been unduly fostered in New South Wales? And when we read the recent note of Lord John Russell on transportation, and found that *none* but Irish, *i. e.* Roman Catholic convicts, are for the future to be sent to that colony, can we come to any other conclusion than that in process of time it will become a Roman Catholic community? And *then* we should like to see *how* Sir Richard Bourke's "equitable footing" principle would act.

It is lamentable, however, to observe the highest of all human concerns thus dealt with by our *expediency* statesmen. In the case before us, one of the chief objects of concern, is the provision made for the support of the clergy, which is, as we have seen, awfully deficient.

We cannot conclude this part of our subject with the spirit-stirring and eloquent appeal of Mr. Justice Burton, in consequence of whose representations the two societies, before alluded to, have again come forward and liberally contributed to the establishment of a college in the neighbourhood of Sydney, for which the site has already been given by a pious individual. We recommend the whole to the attentive consideration of our readers.

Our remarks and extracts on this part of the subject have extended to so great a length, that we are obliged to treat more cursorily than we could wish the other important portion of Mr. Burton's statement. The religious education of the young, is *only inferior* to the religious instruction of the people in *any* community: but in a community like New South Wales, where the temptations to vice and the examples of the vicious are so powerful and alluring, the religious education of the young becomes an object of increased importance. That the Government, therefore, should take an especial interest in the matter is not to be wondered at: the wonder would have been, had the ruling powers neglected to pay attention to it. We find accordingly that the State, confiding in the Clergy of the national Church

had, up to the date of Sir Richard Bourke's despatch, committed into their hands the almost exclusive direction of the education of the poor and destitute. They had likewise, to a considerable, though not sufficient extent, furnished the means for this purpose. On the whole, under the management of the Clergy and the Church and School Corporation, the schools for the education of the poor and destitute children were in a satisfactory state. No complaint was made by parents on account of the religious instruction afforded, nor was any dissatisfaction felt that the direction should be in the hands of the clergy. We must charge Sir Richard Bourke with the heavy guilt of having first unsettled men's minds in New South Wales on this point; and of having introduced religious dissension into the schools of that colony. Not satisfied with "laying the foundations of the public religion" in the colony, by his novel scheme of relieving it from the pressure of *one* Established Church, by calling into existence *three* Established Churches, it seems that he was desirous, likewise, of laying the foundations of public education on an equally novel principle. Taking for his example the system of education introduced, in a luckless hour, into Ireland by Lord Stanley, he proposed to apply it to New South Wales. He forgot, however, the different circumstances of the two communities. Lord Stanley's plan was founded on the principle—the erroneous principle—of getting such portions of the Bible read in schools as the Romish Priest would allow; thereby conceding the priest's position, that the *whole* Bible was unfit for general perusal. Sir Richard Bourke's principle was to take away the Bible from those who had been accustomed to read it without restriction, and to substitute for the unmutilated word of God selected portions, in which no creed should be taught, no particular truth inculcated. In fact, Sir Richard committed the grievous *sin*—he would not even call it *blunder*—of endeavouring to deprive a Protestant community of what they prized equally with their daily bread. With this intent, he gave notice that, on a certain day, all Government aid would be withdrawn from the existing schools; and that new schools would be established in conformity with his plan, in which the religious instruction should be of such a nature, as while it professedly excluded religious creeds of every kind, should yield the very point for which the Romish Church had all along contended, and mutilate the Bible according to her wishes and designs. Here, however, Sir Richard Bourke was destined to encounter an opposition which he little expected. His local Act for un-churching the Church of England, had for its supporters all who departed from her doctrines: so far the despoiling Act was popular. But

there were religious communions in New South Wales who valued their Bible more highly than they prized any blow which the governor might strike against the Church. To the immortal honour of those communions, be it said, they buried at once their feelings of enmity and rivalry, and one and all, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Independents, (Socinians only excluded) gathered round Bishop Broughton, and fought the battle of Protestantism nobly and successfully. True, Sir Richard carried his measure through the council by an unfair and dishonourable artifice; and by taking advantage of a legal quibble, he deprived the Lord Bishop of his seat in that assembly, so that his lordship was obliged to appear *there* as a petitioner, *where*, of right, he should have been a judge.

The influence of the Bishop would, it was imagined, have had an effect upon the votes of the council: nor can we doubt that Sir Richard Bourke would have had considerable difficulty in carrying his measure had the Bishop been present in the Legislative Council. We do not think that one member at least would, *one* day, have been found making a speech out of doors, calling upon his hearers not to suffer themselves and their children to be deprived of their birthright, the Bible, and on *another* have come to the council and voted for that measure which would have deprived thousands for ever of that very birthright. We think that the presence of the Bishop, who would, in that case, have been a witness of *both acts*, would have deterred any man from such cringing and time-serving inconsistency. But be that as it may, the Bishop *was* excluded, the measure was passed, the money was voted, but the schools *were not* established! Sir Richard Bourke, to whom popularity was as essential as the air he breathed, dared not carry into effect his own matured measure. A lesson had been read to him which he would not easily forget; and he left New South Wales without "laying the foundations of public education" on his new and improved principle of discarding the Bible from its schools. We recommend our readers to notice particularly the whole proceeding as clearly narrated by Mr. Justice Burton, whose opinions on this important topic are as sound as his opinions on the subject of the Church, and may be of beneficial service to those who are now engaged in a somewhat similar contest with "liberal statesmen" in this country.

We are glad to be able to add that an attempt of Sir George Gipps, the present governor, to introduce the British and Foreign School system has likewise failed; so that in New South Wales the education of the youth of the Church of England *at present* remains under the influence of the Clergy of that

Church. But for how long? Let our readers judge from the principles avowed by the governor when that subject was under discussion in the council, and which will cause them as much surprise as we have felt in the perusal. Is this a governor, we ask, appointed by her Majesty's advisers? and are these principles in accordance with instructions from home?

"There is another subject on which I wish to say a few words. Upon looking round this table, I cannot help being struck by the fact, that there are thirteen members of one denomination of Christians, and only two others. I do not make these observations for the sake of inducing gentlemen to sacrifice their opinions for the purpose of shewing their generosity, but to remind the council that they sit, not as representatives of any particular sect, but as the guardians of the whole community. When I made this remark, a few days since, the Right Rev. Prelate said, that we are in no other position than that of Parliament—that there is no greater majority of members of the Church of England in this council than there is in the Houses of Lords and Commons. He was quite correct; but I draw a different conclusion from that fact to what his lordship does—I draw a caution from it, for of all the evils that now afflict the mother country, is there one that is not to be traced to this fact—cannot all the calamities, all the dissensions, all the differences, every thing that makes us moan for England, be traced, or are they not traceable to the fact, that the majority of the members of Parliament belong to one religious denomination, and have legislated to preserve the dominancy of that denomination? May God Almighty, I sincerely pray, so guide your minds as to avert this evil from this your rising land. This, gentlemen, comes much nearer to your feelings than mine. Soon after my arrival in this colony, I stated, in answer to one of the addresses presented to me, that I had a greater stake in this colony than lands or possessions, but it is not to be denied, gentlemen, that my interest is transitory—I am but a sojourner in the land, I shall not establish my posterity here. I have but one child, and him I hope to settle in the land of my fathers; but you are fathers, you may be termed the patriarchs of the land, and the interests of your children and your children's children may depend upon your vote this day, whether or not the system of religious equality so happily established shall be carried out, or whether this your adopted land shall be marred by the plague spots of religious dissension. I will now, gentlemen, take the sense of the council upon the first resolution."

We should give our readers a very inadequate idea of Mr. Justice Burton's work, did we not tell them, that it embraces the present state of religion and education in New South Wales in every light in which it can be viewed. We have a detached account of the number and stations of every minister of religion of every denomination, of the various congregations and communicants, of the districts which are unprovided with religious instructors, and of the probable wants of the colony in this respect,

for some years to come. We have, likewise, a full account of the different schools and their efficiency—of the institutions for the education of the higher and middling classes, of the colleges—for Sydney has its colleges, so called—and even of the private schools. There is no information which an emigrant can desire in this respect, which is not to be found in Mr. Burton's book; and when we consider the unquestioning confidence which may be placed in every, the minutest statements, we are assured that a more valuable work, as regards that colony, has not yet issued from the press.

As might have been expected from a gentleman in Mr. Justice Burton's station and religious principles, the condition of the convict population occupies a considerable share of his notice. There is an affecting, though painfully affecting picture of the religious destitution of Norfolk Island, the penal settlement of New South Wales; and a narrative of an atrocious conspiracy, the result, in some measure, of such destitution, which took place in that island—the guilty parties to which Mr. Burton had the painful task imposed upon him of trying and sentencing to death. It is a narrative full of horror, but of such intense interest that we could not shut the book until we had read the whole, though it harrowed up our feelings at every step. What will our readers say of a Government which allowed 1,200 adults, *twice* and *thrice* convicted felons, judged at each conviction *worthy of death*, to be confined on an island without a single minister of religion, without the semblance of the ordinances of Christianity! Yet such was Norfolk Island at the time of Mr. Justice Burton's melancholy visit, and such it might have continued to this moment *but* for that visit. A clergyman of the Church of England and *two* Roman Catholic priests have since been stationed there: the priests being *two*, on the true Romish principle, that, singly, they would be deprived of one of the rites of their Church, viz., the confessional.

The condition of the convicts in the gaols and that of road-gangs, is only less deplorable than those on Norfolk Island. The latter are seldom blessed with the presence of a minister of religion, and the former have only such attendance as the over-burthened clergymen in Sydney and the other towns can give consistently with justice to their other duties. Mr. Burton has pleaded most earnestly and eloquently for this outcast population, both in his works and before the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. We trust that his representations will reach the proper quarter, and be taken into consideration by the Government, who alone can alleviate the evil.

Here, in the want of religious instruction, is to be placed

the main defect in the system of transportation, which a Committee of the House of Commons has declared to have completely failed. Need we say that the committee did not enquire into its working in this respect : if they had contrasted the 755*l.* per annum paid for the religious instruction of the convicts with the 57,740*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.* paid for the police establishment of the colony, as Mr. Burton has done, they would not have made the startling assertion—that the system of transportation not only exhibits an inefficiency in deterring from crime, but likewise “a remarkably efficiency, not in reforming, but in still further corrupting” the criminal, without adding, that *religion formed no part of the system, and that reformation without religion would be a moral impossibility.*

ART. VII.—*Jerusalem and the Jewish Cause : a Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, respecting the State and Prospects of the Jews and the Jewish Mission in Syria.* By the Rev. W. B. HURNARD, M.A. London : Hayward and Moore. 1840.

2. *Israel's Return, or Palestine Regained.* By JOSEPH ELISHA FREEMAN. London : Ward. 1840.

3. *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews.* By the Rev. Dr. McCAUL. London : Wertheim. 1838.

THE Jews have many claims upon Christian sympathy—to them we are indebted for impulses of unspeakable value ; our greatest spiritual blessings have been communicated through Jewish channels. The Jewish and Christian Churches, in their early history, and in their future glories, are twins of the same destiny, around which all prophecy unceasingly revolves.

Apart from all scriptural considerations, a very partial acquaintance with the history of the Jews during their lengthened dispersion, is sufficient to inspire us with regard for them. They may be bowed down by the heavy burden of ages of political slavery, habits may have been acquired, which subsist, in relation to social institutions, in a state of degradation—these will cease as soon as that relation is dissolved, and those institutions are improved ; but the impartial observer will admit, that in struggling through centuries of desolation, as abandoned outcasts, every where unsheltered from the ceaseless storms of pitiless power, yet maintaining their national unity and distinctness, upon the stake of some far distant and mysterious hope they have exhibited an unconquerable freedom of mind, an

VOL. VIII.—K

innate strength of character, which is unequalled. Even the most determined opponent of the realities of prophecy will probably admit, that a despised and persecuted people, who could follow up some ever vanishing object of expectation through so vast an interval of time, with unbroken faith and unrepining confidence—untainted by the fluctuating customs of the world—must possess some latent and enduring energies of mind which would be called forth if the influences which depressed them were taken away:—surely, some extraordinary destiny must await a family which has been guided by such strange instincts. Those who associate nobility with love of country will also regard the Jews; the descendants of Abraham never forget the “pleasant land,” and maintain, under every variety of outward circumstance, the same unperishing attachment to their ancient mountains. The burden of their song is unchangeable: “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.”

There is something peculiarly appalling in the fixedness of the Jewish character, as a proverbial reproach, during a career of bondage so protracted and enduring; the flood of time seems to have carried along with it no exercise of sympathy or remission of oppression. If the pilgrims of sorrow could scan the history of their wearisome journey, and trace the events of successive ages, from the dispersion to the conclusion of the last century, they might mark out certain stages in the great diary, and reckon up at each the civil earnings and benefits conferred upon the commonwealth of Israel; but they would reiterate, at the expiration of every cancelled cycle, an unchanging response: “The enemy hath persecuted my soul, he hath smitten my life down to the ground, he hath made me to dwell in darkness, as those that have been long dead.”

Every year now, however, brings with it a series of events which unite in testifying that the captives are approaching the term of their degradation. In commenting upon these, we have no intention of entering into the soundness of the policy of Christian Governments conferring civil privileges upon unconverted Jews, but merely desire to deal with such circumstances, in common with other novelties of the age, as indicative of the passing away of the Jewish tribulation. The events of the year that is past, although somewhat chequered, have been, nevertheless, very generally delineated in favour of the Jews; the exceptions being limited to a few detached spots, where small sections are infolded in the grasp of some decaying fragment of

the empire of Islam, as at Damascus and Rhodes—but the intervention of foreign powers has been already called forth, and a stop will be put to the repetition of such disgraceful scenes. The Syrian Jews are evidently in the hands of the Philistines; the only wonder is, that similar tragedies have not been more frequently exhibited. So low is the standard of morality in Syria, that Burckhardt affirmed that if a British code of laws was introduced into that country, the mass of the inhabitants would find their way to the penal colonies before the expiration of a year.

During the general relaxation of oppression at first alluded to, the Jews have not been stationary and inactive. Whilst different governments have been occupied in releasing them from the essentials of bondage, they have at the same time been effectually struggling to free themselves from the fetters of Rabbinism; they cannot remain much longer in their present state, and are evidently making rapid progress towards some great and still undefined change. Unhappily, the leaders in the march of reform are taking the ground of rationalism and infidelity. However anxious they may be to induce their brethren to abdicate the follies of Rabbinism, they are, at the same time, ambitious of making it assume new developments, independently of the essential principles of truth which are mixed up with it in the writings of their ancient prophets. They desire “to clothe their ecclesiastical institutions in forms consonant with the age, that those customs which were introduced in unhappy times, should be replaced by others more corresponding with the customs of the present day;” or, in other words, they desire to obliterate all that is venerable and sacred in the institutions of modern Judaism. The apostles of reform seem to have no fixed religious principles—nothing that will be lasting, or that will ever become broadly effective upon the nation, to offer in exchange for the religion of their fathers; instead of upholding the ordinances of Jehovah, and seeking to guide the religious fraternity by the light of the “sure word of prophecy,” they are leading them away from national duties and national destinies by the deceitful glare of an irreligious intellectualism. But that we may not appear to misrepresent their case, we shall give their own view of it in a few brief extracts, and then proceed to the discussion of late political events, which may be looked upon as the harbingers of the fulness of the cycle of bondage.

Dr. Creizenach, a Jewish author of some celebrity, in considering the progress of reform, and consequent decline of “Rabbinico-Talmudical” opinions, states that “in the smallest congregations there are to be found Orthodox and Neologians;

admirers of the Talmud and opponents of the same, strict observers of the ritual law, and enlightened ones who look upon all forms of religion as unessential, and subject to the influence of time." A Parisian Rabbinical writer, with well conceived aversion to the fatal extremities to which they are proceeding, exclaims :—

" Nothing, nothing at all distinguishes the Jew from the Christian in France, and especially in Paris. The former enjoys all rights as well as the latter, and discharge all the functions of Frenchmen. The Jewish-German, forty years ago the language of so many Israelites among us, is even not understood by the younger part of us. But one thing is to be feared, that the professors of our religion in this country will fall into a sceptical deism, if they are not, by a reformed divine worship, and a scientific turn of our theology, again united to our religion in its positiveness."*

Dr. Mc Caul, an able advocate of the Jewish cause, has furnished us with the most complete summary of the rise and progress of Rabbinical reform. The total results of all that has been done, as affecting religious opinions, are quoted to the following effect from Dr. Jost :—

" Although no system has been formed, we think that we have perceived, amongst thinking Jews, a general adoption of the following principles :—All agree that the Jews are no longer a chosen people, in the hitherto received sense, and look upon expressions of this nature in the Liturgy only as an old form. They, however, assert that the Holy Scriptures are the only source of a true religion, capable of standing the test of reason. They remain strangers to the doctrines of Christianity ; and no one believes that a confession of the Christian faith, free from hypocrisy, is possible, unless in those who have been convinced by education and custom. This pure religion consists in the conviction, that a supernatural revelation had been made to the forefathers of Israel, to Moses and the prophets—consequently, in the belief that there is one God. For the instruction of man God has made known, through human instrumentality, that He is the moral Governor of the world, and that His eyes are upon men, valuing and retributing according to their moral worth. This pre-supposes the immortality of the soul. The moral code of Scripture is looked upon as the only true one, in so far as it agrees with principles generally to be acknowledged. It therefore requires not only a moral life, but one based upon religious principle, and not on worldly philosophy. Every thing that appears to militate against this is rejected, and every passage of Scripture that appears hostile is explained from the circumstance of the times : as, for instance, the evil deeds of the patriarchs ; and the same expedient was also applied to the miracles, which some explained away altogether, others endeavoured to explain on natural principles—but this system never became general."

* Jewish Intelligence.

The practical effects of reform may be summed up in the adoption of foreign customs, the setting aside of Rabbinic training, and the deposition of the national language. Reform, on the other hand, has acted favourably in exciting a spirit of inquiry, in developing mental powers long restricted in their free exercise by an exclusive system of religion; it has, moreover, released the Jews from oppression, and made them more accessible to missionary exertion. Long and faithfully have they clung to the traditions of their fathers; but now that the vintage-time of Rabbinism has been for some time past, they seem to be losing their relish for the "*spiced wines of the Gemara*," and the "*wine of the Mishna*:" and it is therefore to be hoped, that the weary pilgrims, who are perishing for lack of knowledge, may be speedily induced to drink deeply of the soul-refreshing "*water of the Bible*."* The conversion of the Jews is a subject of glorious hope. Some of the most able writers of the Anglican Church represent them as being destined to occupy, in bold relief, a prominent position in the Christian Temple; considering the reconciliation of Israel as one of the promised glories of the Gentile Church; the order of events being divinely appointed—that, "as we have now obtained mercy through their unbelief, even so have these also now not believed that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy."† The result involves the most momentous consequences, in accordance with the conclusive inference of St. Paul: "What shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?"

In considering the evidences of the altered political position of the Jews, the Ottoman empire is an important field of enquiry. In 1825, according to German statisticians, there were 300,000 Jews in Asiatic Turkey; a portion of these are now under the sway of Egypt, but the Syrian sovereignty is still claimed by the Ottomans. The precepts of the Koran infuse into the minds of all its followers a spirit of rancour against the Jews; in most Moslem countries they have been disallowed the public exercise of their religion; and the Turks, in particular, have long been hard task-masters to Israel. In the early stages of their history no people could be more decisive in carrying out the principles of their religion; the only prelude to plunder and tribute was the following summary address: "Health and happiness to every one that follows the right way; we require of you to testify that there is one God, and Mahomet is his Prophet." A complete revolution has now taken place, and late

* The Rabbies say that "the Bible is like water; the Mishna like wine and the Gemara like spiced wine."

† Romans xi. 30, 31.

decrees proclaim "that Greeks, Catholics, and Jews are, in common with Turks, all equal before the law;" by which, it has been observed, the Ottomans have actually abjured their religion.

"The state of things in the East is such," observes a Rabbinical commentator on late events, "that the Divan could not altogether overlook the great mass of Turkish Jews, and by a Hatti Scherif, intended to delineate the basis of the intended transformation and renovation of oriental policy, and embracing in general terms all relations, the Jewish congregations were not only openly recognized, but the life, property, and honour of the Jews were placed under public jurisdiction; their military services accepted, and an equal share of taxation imposed upon them. Although the component elements of the East may be more or less able to follow out, and realize these principles, yet by this general equalization a prodigy was accomplished, and a path opened for true civil existence, without being accompanied by those pains and fears which were caused by hoping for the same in Europe."*

The Mahometan system may be fitly compared to the crater of a barren volcano: religious fanaticism, the fire which animated it, and spread with lava-like desolation over Europe, is extinct. Indeed, British and foreign travellers have been, with one or two exceptions, so united in giving their testimony in favour of the hopeless state of the Ottoman empire, that they have been accused of desiring (the opportunity being so favourable) to excite a general crusade to extinguish the Moslem by the application of political force. However much this fanatic spirit (if such really exists) may be reprobated, the Christian and the Israelite may well be pardoned for anticipating the time when the waves of Moslem devastation will no longer ebb and flow over the birth-place of their religious faith. And it cannot be concealed that there is no stability in the supports which active and scheming politicians are applying to the falling edifice. Indeed, the Turks seem to be aware of the wretched state of the empire, and are anxiously anticipating, in evident depression, the speedy fulfillment of the Mahometan prophecies about the Adrianople gate. "The very haughtiest of the Mussulmans believe that the gate is already in existence through which the red Giaours (the Russi) shall pass to the conquest of Stamboul: and that everywhere, in Europe at least, the hat of Frangistan is destined to surmount the turban—the Crescent must go down before the Cross."† And when they consider that their fleets have already been destroyed by their allies, and

* Jewish Intelligence.

† Blackwood, April, 1840, "On Modern Superstition."

their territories occupied by their friends, it is no wonder that they have become very suspicious that the present mystified diplomatists of Western Europe will wind-up by opening the gates of Constantinople to the far-seeing Cabinet of St. Petersburg, although they are professing to maintain the integrity of the empire. At present the hereditary sovereignty of Syria and Palestine is the subject of contention about which foreign diplomatists are so actively at work; whilst the Turk wishes to reclaim, and the Egyptian to legalise the conquest, the Cabinets of Europe are increasing the embarrassments of the case by endless protocols and consultations; and, in the meantime, the ancient claimants are not indifferent spectators of events. At every revolution affecting Palestine they have been long accustomed to look with increased anxiety towards the arena of their past and future greatness. In many places they are at present forming associations in expectation of the necessity of the desired pilgrimage; there are no impediments to their departure, and the Egyptian government have lately proclaimed decisively that they should be allowed to rent and purchase land, so as to become cultivators and proprietors of the soil. The belief in the final restoration of the Jews is so very general among modern Christians, admitted also by the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers, that it would be tedious to bring forward evidence on the subject. The difficulties consist in the adjustment of details and circumstances, and in the order of events, which can only be cleared away with the advance of time; but there is a prediction in Ezekiel xxxvi. 1-15, which, without being dogmatically applied to events of such late date, it may be pardonable to mention from the accurate representation it gives of the present position of the Egyptian despot, the impotent loquacity of modern Idumean diplomatists, and the present state of the children of the captivity. An exulting conqueror is there represented as boasting, "Aha, even the ancient highways are ours in possession;" the desolated country and mountains of Israel as being "taken up in the lips of *talkers*," and as having "become a prey and derision;" and (v. 8) the people of Israel are said to be ready "at hand to come" to the mountains of Israel, which are described as being destined to be never more oppressed with "the shame of the heathen."

In passing on to the proofs of the improved circumstances of the Jews in different kingdoms, Russia may be secondly referred to; for, according to the German census, it contained five years ago, within its Southern and Western boundaries, 658,000 Jews. The late Emperor Alexander was much interested in the welfare of his Jewish subjects; and in a well-meant,

though mistaken, zeal for ameliorating their condition, he appointed settlements in various parts of the empire as refuges and asylums for those who had embraced or should embrace Christianity, where they were to be placed under the especial care and patronage of the Government, admitted to various civil rights, and granted certain privileges. Those who were by this means induced to embrace Christianity for advancement's sake, could not be expected to be sincere converts, and the mass of the Jews continued to adhere to Rabbinical tenets; and until they are conscientiously convinced that their system of religion is wrong, we honour their resolute adherence to a communion endeared to them by a venerable antiquity, and which has moreover been a powerful preservative of national unity, in which character alone so many blessings and so much glory are in store. Although the Jews of Russia are still exposed to much obloquy, the present Emperor has lately improved their general condition: "the more wealthy class can be elected to official situations in their respective townships; Jewish peasants are put in possession of the rights of other settlers, and medical men admitted into the public service."* The present Emperor has also been the first leading genius who has endeavoured to infuse into the minds of his Jewish subjects the principles of military obligation. Small proportions of Jews have fought in the French, and even in our Indian army; and some are also said, in patriotic zeal for the welfare of a government where they were so kindly treated, to have enrolled themselves in the Prussian army previous to the battle of Waterloo. But according to Gonorowski, Hebrew conscription in Russia has been carried on to a great extent, and in "the Russian marine they annually average one in three." Warrior Jews have certainly been novelties in the world; eighteen centuries having rolled over the prostrate Hebrews, during which the enquiry of Deborah in the days of the subjection under Jabin, King of Canaan, has been almost negatively answerable: "When war was in the gates, was there a shield or a spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?" And now, although this sudden transformation of a portion of this domestic people into disciplined bands of kindred brethren may probably be looked upon as an era of calamity in the race, yet, as they maintain, under every change, such substantial national unity, a practical knowledge of the art of war may be considered as an impulse towards the repossession of political power. The Hebrew soldiers are in this case attached to disciplined hosts, which during the last

* Jewish Intelligence.

fifty years have been advanced 500 miles in the direction of Palestine; and if the Levantine nations are ever destined to become subject for a time to Russian sway, no government would be more likely, by an artful stroke of policy, to endeavour to disencumber Europe and Asia of their richest inhabitants, by holding out inducements to the Jews to return to the land of their fathers.

Holland and France, Denmark and Prussia, have lately evinced a ripening desire to ameliorate the condition of their Hebrew subjects. The present King of Denmark, on his accession to the throne, gave assurance that he would effect essential improvements in their state. The King of Holland has lately been evincing his exuberant regard for them, in bestowing gifts on the occasion of the building of a synagogue at Maestricht.* France having extended to them the privileges of citizenship, has lately been remonstrating against their unkind treatment in a neighbouring Swiss canton; and not knowing better how to console an Israelite (now that it is not fashionable to persecute him), has been endeavouring to induce them to forget the past and give up hope for the future, in divesting themselves of all national distinctions, sinking the appellation of "Israelite," and considering themselves at home in France—as having already arrived at the promised land. We need scarcely allude to the late benevolent ruler of Prussia, to whom the banished of Israel were objects of Christian solicitude; but by late accounts from Vienna, it appears that "the proposition of the Comitatus of Pesth, having for its object to grant to the Jews the rights of naturalization, together with the privileges enjoyed by citizens who did not belong to the order of nobility, had been unanimously acceded to by the Hungarian Diet."† Even the Storting, or Diet of Norway, has actually given up all caution, and meditated during the past year the erasure of the clause in the constitution which prohibits the Jew from entering the limits of the land; a step which may be taken with great safety to the commonwealth, from the paucity of attractions which Scandinavia presents to foreign emigration. In England the children of the captivity meet with no unkind treatment; they are objects of interest both with regard to their temporal and eternal welfare. The public attention is directed to their claims, and consequent political importance in the struggle which has commenced in the East. In the appointment of a British Consul to Jerusalem, the general focus of Hebrew pilgrimage, the good-will of this mysterious and vastly influential people has been secured; and by the capture of

• Jewish Intelligence.

† The Times.

Aden a small section of them has been delivered from oppression. The hesitating Rabbinit, who has been accustomed abroad to associate Christianity with idolatry, may now witness our Apostolical worship in its purity,* performed in the language of their ancient prophets; and it has been stated that more Hebrew converts have been made to Christianity during the last twenty years, than in any similar period since the first ages of the Church. The income of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews is increasing, at the same time the society is becoming more strictly Episcopal; it is therefore confidently anticipated that it will speedily receive the more full and entire support of the Church.

Although so many different Governments have thus been separately exerting themselves on behalf of the Jews, no combined political measures have yet been taken by the great powers of Europe to facilitate their restoration; nor have any united efforts been made to ameliorate their condition, in pursuance of the pledges that were given to that effect at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. But the time may not be far distant when events will justify some interposition; for perplexities seem to increase with every additional attempt to arrange matters in the East. And in the belief of an approaching restoration of the Jewish polity, and that no lasting solution of the Eastern crisis can be expected till this takes place, a community of English gentlemen have lately memorialised all the Protestant monarchs of Europe, in a document setting forth the lasting nature of the Jewish claims, and the scriptural evidences of an appointed home-gathering previous to their national conversion, their present preparations for returning, and intense interest in the issue. The petitioners disclaim every requirement of political force, desiring to abide events; and in having brought the subject to the notice of the Protestant princes, conclude, from their favourable reception of it, that if the "set time" is really at hand, instruments will not be wanting who will be willing and ready to help forward the prosperity of Jerusalem.

Many more instances might be brought forward in proof of the altered condition of the Jews, and of the progressive disruption of Gentile prejudices. The fractions which have been given are sufficiently striking pledges of an approaching crisis, and afford ample scope for meditation. For if these wonderful sufferers have been, in accordance with prophecy, held forth to the observation of men for so many ages as objects of scorn, and we now see them casting off the distinguishing badges of an outcast people, and meeting with goodwill for hatred, and kind-

ness for contumely; if they have reached forward to this distant goal of time as memorials of ancient days, in which we observe a relationship between the daily habits and the national character of centuries, and now we see them shaking off the fastenings of custom, and figuring upon the platform of Europe as magistrates and philosophers, disciplined troops and Christian missionaries; if the Moslem sword has been so long suspended in uncertainty over the head of the pilgrim to the land of his fathers, and now the religion of Mahomet is wasting away, the gates of Jerusalem are open to the Christian and the Jew, and the rival competitors for the land of Israel are dependent upon the arbitration of Christian princes; if the Jews, disencumbered of Rabbinitism, are awakening from the lethargy of centuries, combining for prayer and pilgrimage, anxiously debating their condition, (the first step in the process of conversion,) and either listening to the sound of the Gospel, or else driven to despair by surrounding darkness and idolatry, are abandoning hope, and lapsing into the gloom of scepticism—then altogether there is a combination of novelties presented to our view which warrant the conclusion, that they are either fast approaching the goal of their immortality as a nation, or else that the day of their redemption is at hand. We are thrown upon times peculiarly prophetic. “The Apocalypse,” it has been aptly remarked, “in its sublime visions, indicates that the regions of men and the moral world have presiding angels, whose power is restrained until the mandate of the Almighty shall let them loose, like whirlwinds, in overwhelming destruction of things as they are, for the development and manifesting of things as they shall be. Who can doubt but that some such command was given a generation back, and that the first furious burst, which shook every throne in Europe, making monarchs tremble in their capitals, and rupturing the bonds of existing society in the first French revolution, was the thunder-clap the vibrations of which we are now experiencing.”* It seems as if the Rabbinitists, who have abided so long without advance or retrocession, were also yielding to the power of the great “movement” which is ranging impartially over the earth, and threatening in its progress the dissolution of all established political and ecclesiastical institutions; but as history proves that national convulsions have always responded to the loosening of the bars of Israel’s captivity, and there are divine announcements that Jerusalem’s recovery shall be synchronous with distress of nations, and the fulness of the times

* Memorials of Israel. By Henry Innes.

of the Gentiles ; many late writers consider that the present stormy state of the world is but a step in the development, by an unerring power, of the process of rescue for Israel.

“ Poor nation, whose sweet sap and juice
Our cyons have purloin’d, and left you dry :
Whose streams we got by the Apostle’s sluice,
And use in baptism while ye pine and die :
Who by not keeping once became a debtor ;
And now by keeping lose the better.

“ O that my prayers ! mine, alas !
O that some angel might a trumpet sound,
At which the Church, falling upon her face,
Should cry so loud, until the trump were drown’d ;
And by that cry of her dear Lord obtain
That your sweet sap might come again.”

GEORGE HERBERT.

Those who look upon the Jews merely as so many scattered fragments of an antiquated ruin, in which the elements of ancient times live and breathe, and can perceive nothing peculiar in their past history or present state, will probably throw obloquy upon every attempt to reclaim them. Others, principally dissenters, admit that the Jew needs the Gospel as well as the heathen, but consider the world to be independently advancing to the meridian of universal righteousness, through the agency of existing means ; and can therefore afford to trace out for the descendants of Abraham no higher destiny, than that of being denationalized, and absorbed into their various communities. Thus all nations would become evangelized through the agency of different sections of Christians, subdividing and disagreeing about non essentials, without order, harmony, unity, or combination, an instrumentality very inadequate (an unprejudiced mind will admit) to work out such a glorious consummation. A numerous class of writers, treading in the steps of Bishops Louth, Butler, Horsley, and Van Mildert anticipate, from reiterated scriptural announcements, a conclusion to the marvellous history of the ancients, more analogous to the past procedure of Providence. Admitting that the Gentile Church has special glories of its own, they consider the gathering of a remnant of the Jews as one of its offices, and the appointed prerequisite to some future remarkable and powerful display of Providence in their favor ; that scriptural truths of the greatest moment will then be revealed to them in the appalling brightness of unavoidable light—their national conversion and reconciliation brought about at once.

It is nowhere intimated in Scripture that there should be, during the present dispensation, any broad exception to the rule, that "straight is the way and narrow is the gate that leadeth unto life;" and accordingly, the expansive power of Christianity has ever been repressed by some dark and hidden influence. The Church has ever been ailing, and beset with danger in its allotted pathway to final victory. But if reiterated predictions, uttered in the most simple language, be interpreted according to the primitive sense—the rule of interpretation adopted by our Lord and his Apostles—there is yet in reserve for this memorable people a national pre-eminence, during which they will stand forward as leading supporters of the divine standard of peace in the last ages of the Church as well as in the first; and the most efficient collectors of the revenue of glory, when the "earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

ART. VIII.—*Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England; being a Collection of Injunctions, Declarations, Orders, Articles of Inquiry, &c. from the year 1546 to the year 1716; with Notes, historical and explanatory.* By EDWARD CARDWELL, D.D., Principal of St. Alban's Hall. Oxford: at the University Press. 2 vols. 8vo. 1839.

[SECOND NOTICE.]

THE private writings of our venerated Reformers are, in consequence of various reprints of considerable portions of them during the last forty years, generally known and extensively circulated: but those documents, which were put forth by authority at the period of the Reformation, and which must be regarded as speaking the sentiments of the Anglican Church, and, in many cases, as a comment on our various services, are known to comparatively few.

To give an illustration of the point in question, we may allude to the controversies now going forward, within the pale of the Church, respecting certain usages. By one party these usages are said to be lawful, and enjoined by the Reformers; the other asserts exactly the contrary. Now, in our opinion, the dispute may, in many instances, be settled by a reference to those documents which were published throughout the reign of Elizabeth, by authority of the Church.

Feeling, as we do, that the subject is a very important one, we shall devote a second article to Dr. Cardwell's valuable work, entitled "*Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of*"

England." We sincerely hope that Dr. Cardwell will follow out the plan to which he alludes in his preface, of publishing other documents, besides those which are included in the present volumes. We are convinced that those to which we allude would settle many disputes: they would evidence the views of the Reformers on certain questions now eagerly canvassed: and the advantages would be experienced by the Church in general.

It strikes us, too, that such works should issue from our Universities; and, assuredly, the Clarendon Press could not be more advantageously employed than in sending them forth to the public. Those which have already appeared can be regarded as an earnest only of the vast harvest to be reaped, in due time, from the same field.

It should be observed that the late Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Lloyd, was the first to commence the publication of works of this description. In the year 1825 he published "Formularies of Faith, put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII." The volume contains the first public documents after King Henry had renounced the jurisdiction of the Pope. It was deemed necessary, in the early days of the Reformation, to publish certain formularies, lest the people, by being emancipated from the Roman forms, should degenerate into licentiousness. The first work of the kind was the "Articles about Religion, A.D. 1536." This was the commencement of the great work in England. Many popish views were retained, but many were renounced; and the giving up of some opened the door for renouncing others. These Articles, with the other works of the same reign, possess no authority now: but they are interesting documents, inasmuch as they may be regarded as the germs of that abundant harvest which was reaped at a subsequent period. We are enabled, by means of these, and by comparing them with those of the next reign, and that of Elizabeth, to trace the progress of opinion in the minds of the Reformers, and the commencement of that change which was at length so happily effected. They were published under the auspices of Cranmer, to whom the Church and the Reformation in England were so deeply indebted.

In 1537, the second work of this reign was set forth, entitled "The Institution of a Christian Man." It contains many of the preceding Articles, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and comments and expositions upon them. It is divided into four parts, the first containing an exposition of the Creed; the second an exposition or declaration of the Seven Sacraments; the third an exposition of the Ten Commandments; the fourth of the Paternoster, the Ave, with the Articles of Mortification and Pur-

gatory. It was called the "Bishops' Book," because it was arranged and prepared by the Bishops.

In 1548, or perhaps earlier, a third work made its appearance, under this title, "The necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man." It was called the "King's Book," to distinguish it from the preceding, and because King Henry was, probably, more concerned in it than in the other. It has a Preface by the King, or, at all events, in the King's name; while the preface to the former is from the Bishops, and addressed to his Majesty. There is a difference in the arrangement of this work from the former: otherwise, with the exception of some few additional matters, it varies but little from the "Bishops' Book."

In all these works there is much that is erroneous, but, at the same time there is much that is sound and scriptural; and they may be viewed as evidences of the dawning of that bright day which soon after burst upon the country in full meridian splendour, and in the enjoyment of which we are still living. More might be said on the public documents of the reign of Henry VIII., but our limits do not permit of our entering on the subject, at present, at greater length.

With respect to the works enumerated in our former article on this subject, we may remark that we are indebted for not a few of them to the attacks of opponents. The attacks of the Papists gave birth to "Jewel's Apology," to his "Defence," and to "Nowel's Catechism," all works of authority. The attacks of the Puritans called forth Whitgift and Hooker; whose works in defence of our Church have never been answered. Cartwright drew Whitgift into the controversy, and Hooker was led into it by Travers; and but for the assaults of those individuals, the "Defence" of Whitgift, and the "Ecclesiastical Polity" of Hooker would never have been written.

Almost every topic discussed by modern Dissenters, is considered and disposed of by Whitgift in his admirable "Defence." The reader is aware that, at an early period of the reign of Elizabeth, the Puritans published an "Admonition to the Parliament," in which their objections to the rites and ceremonies retained in the Anglican Church were stated. A copy of this curious and extremely rare performance is now on our table. It has neither date nor name of the printer. It was, however, published about the year 1570. After a careful examination of this curious document, and comparing it with certain English works printed about the same time on the continent, we are decidedly of opinion that it was printed in Germany. Many books were printed in different places abroad, and then circulated in England. Soon after the publication of the "Admo-

nition" the Puritans established a press, which they removed from place to place to prevent discovery, and from which many of their tracts and pamphlets issued : but it does not appear that the "Admonition" itself was printed in England.

Whitgift became the champion of the Church on this occasion in "An Answer to the Admonition." The author of the "Admonition" was never discovered : but Cartwright, who, if he was not concerned in the writing, was cognizant of its publication, took up his pen to defend the positions advanced by the Puritans. His work was entitled "A Reply to the Defence." Whitgift, within a comparatively short space, replied in his great work called "A Defence of the Answer to the Admonition." He adopted the method so common with controversialists in those days, first printing a paragraph of the "Admonition" with his own "Answer," then "Cartwright's Reply," and his own "Defence" of his original arguments. In this work, he not only strengthened his arguments against the "Admonition," but also replied to all the cavils of his adversary. This laborious performance embraces almost all those topics which have been agitated in modern times ; at least all those which relate to rites and ceremonies. It is a work of very great value ; nor can any churchman regard his library as complete on this question, so long as it is destitute of a copy.

The field which has been opened by Dr. Cardwell is a most extensive one, and our hope is that he will not fail to cultivate it to its fullest extent. We would strongly recommend the publication of all the occasional prayers, which, from the commencement of the Reformation, have been set forth by authority to be used on particular occasions. A most useful, interesting, and valuable volume might be prepared from the public *forms* set forth by authority, from the reign of Elizabeth down to the present time, or at all events to the end of the reign of George III. On days of Fasting and Thanksgiving, it was customary, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, to publish a few prayers in a separate form, to be used with the regular services of the day. We are not sure that all these prayers are to be recovered : but we know that many of them are still to be found, as we have often seen them, and some are preserved in Strype. It would, therefore, be easy to collect and arrange them in chronological order.

After the accession of James, if not some years previous to the death of Elizabeth, a different practice was adopted. Instead of printing the special prayers in a distinct form, the whole morning and evening service was printed by the King's printer, the particular prayers being introduced at proper places ; and in some instances, though not frequently, they were substituted for

some of the prayers in the daily services. We say that it was not often that any part of the service was excluded; on the contrary, the new prayers were read in addition to the usual ones. This we are enabled to state with confidence, as we have examined many of the forms for Fasting and Thanksgiving put forth by authority in the reign of James I., Charles I., Charles II., and William and Mary.

An examination of such services will shew how, in each succeeding age, the governors of the Church were actuated by the spirit of the Reformers. A selection of prayers from such Occasional Forms, would constitute one of the most valuable accompaniments of our admirable Liturgy. It would show that the mantle of the Reformers descended on their successors in the Church. There is the same fervent piety, the same ardour of devotion, the same strict adherence to Scripture truth as in the Liturgy itself. Feeling that the services to which we allude are of great value, we shall add a few notices respecting some of them (taking them as a sample) before we proceed to the interesting matters contained in Dr. Cardwell's second volume.

Several Occasional Forms are now lying on our table, and the following quotations are given from the originals.

The Prayer for the High Court of Parliament was inserted in the Liturgy at the last review in 1661: but a similar prayer had been occasionally used long before, though it did not form a portion, as is now the case, of the Book of Common Prayer. The following is copied from one of the Occasional Forms of the reign of Charles I. It is entitled, "A Prayer for the High Court of Parliament, to be read during their Session, in such place of these Prayers after the Litanie, as the Minister shall think fit."*

"Most gracious God, we humbly beseech thee, as for this kingdom in general, so especially for the high court of Parliament, under our most religious and gracious King at this time assembled. That thou wouldst be pleased to bless and direct all their consultations to the preservation of thy glory, the good of thy Church, the safety, honour, and welfare, of our sovereign and his kingdoms. Lord, look upon the humility and devotion with which they are come into thy courts: and they are come into thy house in assured confidence upon the merits and mercies of Christ (our blessed Saviour) that thou wilt not deny them the grace and favor which they beg of thee. Therefore, O Lord, bless them with all that wisdom which thou knowest necessary to speed and bring

* The same prayer occurs in a Form of the year 1628, which will be noticed in a subsequent page; and also in another of 1640, both of which are now before us.

their great designs into action, and to make the maturity of his Majesty's and their councils the happiness and the blessing of this commonwealth. These and all other necessities, for them, for us, and thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour."*

From this prayer it will be seen that the slander not unfrequently put forth by Dissenters, to the effect that the term *religious* was applied for the first time, as a fulsome compliment to Charles II., is destitute of any foundation; for the date of the Form from which it was taken shews that, at all events, it had been used as early as 1625. It is clear, therefore, that the assertion is made without any knowledge of the subject, or without any regard for the truth; and many other assertions from the same party, respecting our Liturgy, have no better foundation.

To the *Form* from which the preceding Prayer is taken there is a preface, which, as an indication of the views entertained by the rulers of the Church at the time, and as being in strict accordance with the formularies of the Church, deserves to be preserved. We give, therefore, the following extract:—

"We be taught by many and sundry examples of Holy Scriptures, that upon occasions of particular punishments, afflictions and perils, which God of his most just judgment hath sometimes sent among his people, to shewe his wrath against sinne, and to call them to repentance, and to the redresse of their lives, all men ought to be provoked and stirred up to more fervencie and diligence in prayer, fasting, and almes-deeds, to a more deepe consideration of their consciences, to ponder their unthankfulnesse and forgetfulnesse of God's merciful benefits towards them, with craving of pardon for the time past, and to ask his assistance for the time to come, to live more godly, and so to be defended and delivered from all further perils and dangers. Now, therefore, calling to minde that God hath beene provoked by us to visit us at this present with the plague and other grievous diseases, it hath beene thought meete to excite and stirre up all God's people within this realme, to pray earnestly and heartily to God to forgive us our sinnes, and consequently to turne away his deserved wrath from us, and to restore us to his gracious favour, and to our bodily health. And, although it is every Christian man's duty, of his own devotion, to pray at all times, yet the corrupt nature of man is so slothful and negligent herein, he hath neede, by often and sundry means, to be stirred up and put in remembrance of his duty. For the effectual

* See "A Form of Common Prayer, together with an Order of Fasting for averting God's heavy visitation upon many places in this Kingdom, and for the drawing down of his blessings upon us and our armies, by sea and land. The Prayers are to be used every Wednesday during this visitation, Set forth by his Majesty's authority. Anno 1625."

accomplishment whereof, it is thought meet that this order of Prayer following should at this time be published, being such as shall be used by the Minister in the Church, and may by every man in his private family."

In those days many of the clergy, who held the cure of souls, were not permitted to preach; to perform that duty it was necessary to have a license to preach, in addition to the ordinary license. At the end of the Form of Prayer from which the above extracts are taken, is an address or exhortation suited for the time; and before this address there is "a short preface to be used before the exhortation following, by the Minister, who is not a preacher." It closes in the following words:—

"There is set down here, agreeable to the time, a godly exhortation or epistle (as it may well be termed) written unto you all here present, by such as are in authority, and do love you with an unfeigned love in Christ Jesus, who intreat you by the mercies of God, that you will be content and willing to hear, what for your good, and upon mature deliberation, they do write unto you, not as of themselves, but in the blessed name of the most glorious Trinity, to whom they cease not to commend you in all their daily prayers."

The exhortation itself *first* states the causes of the pestilence then raging, and *secondly* the remedy. Under the first head we read,—

"Add, moreover, that swearing, outrageous oaths, and cursed speakings, are to be heard out of the mouths of all estates, yea, even of very children in our street, whereby the name of God is very grievously profaned. Add, also, that our trades and traffic is become the practice of deceit, and theft, while we make our gain by lying, for-swearing, false measure, false weights, and false lights, which are an abomination unto the Lord. Besides all these, the Lord's Day is not kept holy, but polluted; the Word of God, and the ministry thereof, is not revered, but despised; his holy sacraments are either neglected or abused."

We quote these passages, feeling that they afford as accurate a description of the state of things in the year 1840 as in the year 1625, when the exhortation was written.

At the close of the exhortation are some directions respecting the *order of the Fast*. One of these directions is singular, as furnishing an illustration of the manners of the times with respect to public preaching. It appoints,

"That on the said Fasting Day there be but one sermon at morning prayer, and the same not above an hour long, and but one at evening prayer, of the same length, to avoid the inconvenience that

may grow by the abuse of fasting, some esteeming it a meritorious work: others a good work, and of itself acceptable to God, without due regard to the end; others presuming factiously to enter into public fasts without the consent of authority, and others keeping the people together with overmuch weariness and tediousness a whole day together: which, in this time of contagion, is very dangerous in so thick and close assemblies of the multitude."

Two curious facts are evident from this extract: the *one*, that on some occasions more than one sermon was preached, the *other*, that the sermons in those days were very long. Nay, it seems that sometimes the people were kept together during the whole day. The direction contains also an admirable caution against the abuse of fasting.

The next year, 1626, another public form was set forth under the same circumstances of war and pestilence,* at the end of which is an *exhortation* to be addressed to the people at the close of the service. It contains the following expressions concerning the Anglican Church:—

"O but some will say, are we not the professors of God's truth, having the light of his gospel among us, together with the holy seals of his covenant? True, our Church of England, by the singular mercy of God in Christ Jesus, may truly and confidently boast herself in comparison with any other, that she, under a most gracious and religious king, is for truth of doctrine and purity of worship, as truly catholic and orthodox as ever any Church of Christ hath been since the days of the Apostles: insomuch in this our English and Spanish war, truth may seem to fight against falsehood, innocence against anti-christian cruelty, and sincerity of worship against flat idolatry; and, therefore, say you, what can be expected from God by us in this battle but victory and great triumph? Nay, deceive not your own-selves by claim of self-privileges, as though, forsooth, *Israel* (even the peculiar people and ark of God, carrying the sign of his covenant in their flesh, acquainted with his oracles, and possessed of the ark and temple of God), did not (notwithstanding) complain, that God went not out with their armies."

In the year 1628, another Form was put forth by authority. It appears that it was a time of war, and that the reformed Churches on the continent were in imminent danger. The special prayers, therefore, on this occasion referred to two points: *first*, to the war itself; *secondly*, to the case of the reformed Churches. This is evident from the title itself: "A Forme of Prayer necessary to be used in these dangerous times

* Its title is different from the preceding:—"A Forme of Prayer, necessary to be used in these dangerous times of war and pestilence, for the safety and preservation of his Majesty and his realms. Set forth by authority. London, 1662.

of warre, wherein we are appointed to fast according to his Majestie's proclamation, for the preservation of his Majestie and his realms, and all reformed Churches."*

There are several Occasional Prayers in this Form, one of which is thus entitled :—" A prayer for all reformed Churches in Christendome." From this Prayer we give the following :—

" Almighty God, and Gracious Father, we confess against ourselves that we are most worthy of all the judgments that thou hast threatened against us, these kingdoms, this Church, and other reformed Churches much more, which are under the Cross, and near to utter ruin and extirpation. We beseech thee to hear the prayers and supplications, with strong cries and tears, which once our blessed Saviour offered for us upon the cross, and in the garden, and daily represents unto thee, and for his reverence, piety, and all-sufficient merits, which speak better things than the blood of Abel. Hear not the cry of our sins, but hear the cry of his blood, and therein wash away all our sins. Let their and our great miseries and dangers suffice for that which is past ; and let that orator in thine own bosom, that is, thine own fatherly goodness, persuade and prevail for them and us, and purchase their deliverance and our safety. Hear us as fellow-members of one and the same mystical body, that have a fellow feeling of another's calamities."

A second Prayer under the same title occurs in the same Form. The following is an extract :—

" Furthermore, in an humble and thankful acknowledgment of thy gracious Providence, in still protecting divers other Churches of the same Catholic faith, in freedom from all anti-Christian tyranny ; continue, we beseech thee, thy powerful assistance unto them, that their hearts, (maugre the malice of whatsoever enemy, whether ghostly or bodily), may be all united together, both in the sincerity of one Christian faith, and in an inviolable and mutual faithfulness one with another."

These Prayers are evidence of the sympathy felt by the members of the Anglican Church for their brethren on the continent, among whom a different discipline and government prevailed ; for the Church of England did not, on that account, withhold her sympathy : nor, on the other hand, can the expression of sympathy be construed into an approval of their mode of Church government. The members of the Anglican Church viewed them as brethren in distress, without giving any opinion on the government which they had adopted. It was not unusual, at a later period, to insert a similar Prayer for the Reformed Churches in the occasional services.

We are not the advocates of the measures adopted by

* London, 1628.

Archbishop Land: but we are constrained to say that his memory has been unfairly treated. The Puritans charged him with being a Papist; and the charge is repeated in the present day, not only by Dissenters, but by some members of our Church. It is unnecessary for us to defend his character; but we give the following extracts from "A Forme of Common Prayer" of the year 1640, appointed to be used on a Fast Day, on occasion of the plague:—

"O most merciful and gracious Lord, we wretched and miserable sinners humbly beseech thee, in mercy and compassion to behold our great afflictions: for thy wrath is gone out, and thine indignation is kindled against us. We confess, O Lord, that thy judgments are just, for we have multiplied our transgressions like the sand of the sea, and the cry of them hath been so great, that it hath pierced the heavens, and called for vengeance against us: but we beseech thee, O Lord, forget not thou to be gracious, and shut not up thy loving kindness in displeasure: turn thee again, and be merciful unto thy servants."

Again—

"O eternal God and most gracious Father, we confess that by our manifold transgressions we have deserved whatsoever thy law hath threatened against sinners; our contempt of thy Divine Service is great, and we hear thy word and obey it not; our charity to our neighbour is cold, and our disobedience unbounded. Religion is with many of us, as in too many places besides, made but a pretence for other ends than thy service; and there hath been little or no care among us to keep truth and peace together, for the preserving of both Church and State. Forgive us, O Lord, forgive us these and all other our grievous sins. Send us light in our understandings, readiness and obedience in our wills, discretion in our words and actions; true, serious, and loyal endeavours for the peace and prosperity of our Jerusalem, the unity and glory of this Church and State, that we may love it, and prosper in it: that we may be guided by thy grace in this life, and received to thy glory in the life to come, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Now it must be remembered that in the year 1640, when these Prayers were set forth, Laud was at the zenith of his power; he was then Archbishop of Canterbury, and the confidential adviser of the Crown. The Prayers were probably composed by himself; at all events, they were submitted to his inspection, and set forth under the sanction of his authority, and they may be regarded as evidence of the soundness of his views on all important points.

Having selected specimens of the Prayers from the Occasional Services of two reigns, we proceed to that of Charles II.; and perhaps no one could be more suited to our purpose, than the special service appointed to be used immediately after the

fire of London in 1666. It is intitled, "A Form of Common Prayer, to be used on Wednesday, the Tenth day of October next, throughout the whole Kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, being appointed by his Majestie a day of Fasting and Humiliation, in consideration of the late dreadful FIRE, which wasted the greater part of the City of London. Set forth by his Majestie's special command. London, 1666."

There is a sort of advertisement prefixed to the Service, which is couched in the following terms, and which we quote as a proof that in those times the regal authority was not unfrequently exercised in appointing special services, and in reminding the clergy of their important duties :—

"His Majesty hath commanded all ministers, with all possible earnestness to stir up the people of their several congregations that day to a charitable and bountiful contribution for the relief of those many poor distressed persons who suffer by reason of this fire: which money so collected is speedily to be sent up to the Lord Mayor of the City of London to be disposed of, as by his Majestie's proclamation is graciously provided and declared. And this collection is to be made, either in the public congregation, or by going from house to house, as shall be most conducing to this charitable and pious work."

The following extract from "A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving," set forth A.D. 1683, will be read with interest by those who are acquainted with the reproaches not unfrequently cast upon the Church in the days of Charles II. It will shew that the rulers of the Church were not ignorant, as is often asserted, of the doctrines of the Gospel. It alludes to the discovery of a conspiracy.

"Defend our Sovereign Lord the King with the whole royal family, from all treasons and conspiracies. Bind up his soul in the bundle of life: and let no weapon formed against him prosper. Be unto him [a] helmet of salvation, and a strong tower of defence against the face of his enemies."

As a final extract from those Occasional Services, which from time to time were set forth by authority, we select a portion of "A Prayer for all the Reformed Churches," from a Form of the reign of William and Mary.* At this time King James's party was strong in Ireland: therefore the Church in Ireland is specially alluded to in the prayer :—

* "A Form of Prayer to be used on Wednesday the Twelfth day of March next ensuing, throughout the whole kingdom, being the Fast-Day appointed by the King and Queen's proclamation: to be observed in a most solemn and devout manner, for supplicating Almighty God for the pardon of our sins, and for imploring his blessing and protection in the preservation of his Majesty's sacred person, and the prosperity of his arms in Ireland, and the naval forces. By their Majesties special command. London, 1689."

"O God the Father of mercies, who of thy great goodness hast united us unto thy holy Church, the mystical body of Christ, we as living members thereof, mourning with them that mourn, and rejoicing with them that rejoice, do now present our supplications and prayers at the throne of thy grace, in behalf of all the Reformed Churches, particularly for our distressed brethren in Ireland: beseeching thee to look down with an eye of mercy and pity upon the sad and mournful estate of such of them whom thou hast delivered over to the hands of superstitious and merciless men, who have compelled so many of them to defile themselves with their idolatrous worship. Stretch out thy arm against those deceitful and bloody men: suffer them not still to triumph over thy heritage. Deliver thou those that are as sheep appointed for the slaughter. Plead thou thy cause with them that blaspheme thy truth, and persecute thy people. Purge all thy Churches from their dross, and make them meet for a glorious deliverance, that so all the world may see that salvation belongs to our God: and that though he hides his face from his people for a season, yet he will not cast them off utterly. Grant that thy true religion may so shine as to become the joy of the whole earth: and that all anti-christian idolatry, superstition, and cruelty, being cast out of thy house, all that name the name of Christ may depart from iniquity, and that the kingdom of thy dear Son may come quickly."

We cannot but believe that we have rendered an acceptable service to our readers in giving these extracts from the special services. They are conceived in the spirit of the Reformers, whose views were embodied in the Liturgy. It would be a work of great utility, if any one would undertake the task of collecting, arranging, and re-publishing all such services from the commencement of the Reformation; and no one is better qualified for that task than Dr. Cardwell. He has given the two Liturgies of King Edward to the public, and also the Injunctions and Documents which have been issued under royal authority; and he would confer a benefit upon the Church if he would also reprint all the special services.

A few remarks respecting the authority of such services, as those from which we have given extracts, may not be out of place while we are discussing such a subject. The power to enjoin special services on days of Thanksgiving and Fasting is lodged in the Crown. The following rubric recognizes that authority:—"And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the church, during the time of divine service, but by the minister; nor by him any thing but what is prescribed in the rules of the Common Prayer, or enjoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place." And it is, indeed, a part of that ecclesiastical supremacy which has ever been possessed by the Crown.

From the commencement of the Reformation down to the present time, therefore, it has been the practice for the Crown

to appoint special services for particular occasions. It is not, however, to be supposed that the prayers are composed and arranged by the ministers of the Crown. When any occasion arises to render it desirable to appoint a day of Fasting or Thanksgiving, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his suffragans, is ordered to prepare a suitable form of Prayer, which is afterwards enjoined to be used by royal authority. We have heard of clergymen who have disputed the right of the Crown to enjoin special services; but we never heard of an instance in which the order was resisted. And we are certain, if on no other ground, yet on that of the supremacy alone, any clergyman who should refuse to comply would be obnoxious, not only to ecclesiastical censure, but to the severest penalties.

There are some few topics in Dr. Cardwell's *first* volume, which we had intended to have noticed in our last article, and which may be glanced at in the present.

It appears from Queen Mary's articles, addressed to Bonner, and also from Bonner's Visitation Articles, that the Church of Rome did not then re-ordain those who had been ordered according to the English service, but merely supplied those ceremonies which had been omitted. The Queen's articles are express:—

“Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any orders after the new sort and fashion of orders, considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the diocese finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before; and then according to his discretion admit them to minister.”—(vol. I., 114.)

One of Bonner's Articles of Inquiry is equally explicit on this subject:—

“Whether any such as were ordered schismatically and contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church, or being unlawfully and schismatically warned after the late innovation and manner, being not yet reconciled nor admitted by the ordinary, have celebrated or said either mass or divine service within any cure or place of this city or diocese.”—(vol. I., 133.)

At that time, therefore, the Romanists received those who were ready to submit, after supplying the ceremonies which had been omitted. It is clear, therefore, that they viewed their orders as valid, but defective in some parts. Such was the course in Queen Mary's days.

But now they deny the validity of orders conferred by the Anglican Church; and they have done so since the days of Elizabeth. If, however, the orders conferred in King Edward's

reign were valid, those which have been conferred since, and which are still conferred, are equally so. There is no better reason for questioning our orders now than there was at that time. It is, therefore, evident that the Romanists are inconsistent in the matter: admitting a principle at one time which they repudiate at another. The custom now is, to treat a clergyman of the Church of England as a layman; and if he should renounce Protestantism, and should wish to become a Romish priest, he must be re-baptized, and confirmed, and then re-ordained. When the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer quitted the Church of England, and joined himself to the Church of Rome, he was treated as a mere layman. The truth is, popery acts differently at different times—it suits itself to circumstances.

After Elizabeth had been some years on the throne, a practice, which had first been adopted in Scotland, and which was designated *exercising* or *prophesying*, became general in many of the dioceses of England. Much misrepresentation has prevailed on this subject, and almost all dissenting writers consider the suppression of the exercises as the suppression of preaching. The facts of the case may be stated in a few words.

The clergy who assembled, commenced their meeting with prayer; then the Moderator read the first verse of the text under discussion. Certain clergymen then read their own observations, and one of the number delivered an *extempore* address. It was then open for the rest of the clergy to give their opinions. The meeting was concluded with prayer.

For some years these *exercises*, as they were termed, were carried on, and they became very popular with those clergymen who had a leaning to the principles of the Puritans. Most of the Bishops gave their sanction; and it appears certain that the texts for discussion were proposed, in each diocese, by the diocesan.

In forming an estimate of the proceedings of those times, we must never lose sight of the peculiar circumstances in which the Church of England was placed. On the one side she was attacked by the Romanists, on the other by the Puritans; and it is a certain fact, that the *exercises* or *prophesyings* were greatly abused by the latter. They became, in short, factious assemblies, in which the disaffected clergy laboured to propagate their peculiar views of Church discipline and order.

Under these circumstances, the Queen issued a letter to the Bishops, requesting them to suppress the *exercises* altogether. Dr. Cardwell has printed the letter (vol. i. 373-4). Grindall refused to comply, and he was for a time sequestered from his

jurisdiction. In the end he became reconciled to the Queen, but he never fully regained her Majesty's favour.

Dissenting writers raise a great outcry against Elizabeth for suppressing these meetings; but, in the state of the Church at that time, she could scarcely have done otherwise. Such assemblies were calculated only for a time of peace, whereas that was a time of discord. The meetings, instead of advancing the interests of piety, degenerated into angry discussions. In the present day they might probably be revived with advantage, but in the reign of Elizabeth they could not have been carried on with safety. Still, it is too much to expect that this matter, or any other in which the Church of England is concerned, should be treated with candour by dissenters.

As the question of *Orders* is now discussed with some degree of asperity, we may be permitted to submit a few remarks. The opinions of the Reformers on this subject are not explicitly stated in their works; but that they viewed Episcopacy as Apostolic in its origin, is a point that cannot be disputed. In an article in a former number, we have exhibited the views of the Reformers on the question of orders in foreign Churches, and therefore need not dwell upon it now; but the following extract may be given from Dr. Cardwell's work, as evidence that the Bishops began to view the admission of ministers, who had been ordained in other Churches where Presbytery prevailed, to preferments in England, as an irregularity:—"Whether doth he or any other take upon them to read lectures, or preach, being mere lay persons, or *not ordered according to the laws of this realm*, or not lawfully licensed." This passage is taken from certain articles issued by Archbishop Whitgift, for the diocese of Chichester, during the vacancy of the see in the year 1585.

There can be no doubt that the Act of the 13th of Queen Elizabeth permitted ministers to officiate in the English Church who had not been Episcopally ordained; and, to use the words of Dr. Cardwell, "this is one of the earliest declarations from authority against orders conveyed by Presbyters." The matter was, indeed, discussed in the case of Whittingham, and again, some years later, in that of Travers; but it was left undecided. Travers pleaded the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth, which admitted ministers from foreign Churches to officiate in England. By the Act of Uniformity, however, it was ordered that no one should be admitted to any ecclesiastical office who had not been Episcopally ordained. By this Act, therefore, the practice was decided; but no opinion has ever been given by the Church on the principle.

That the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth was attempted to be

carried, in some cases, beyond the intention of its frames, is evident from the instances of Whittingham and Travers. For, admitting that regular Presbyterian orders were contemplated by the Act, it cannot be argued that its authors intended to include all irregular ordinations, and certainly not those which were performed by mere laymen; yet it is by no means certain, that either of these individuals had been ordained according to the laws of any Church in the world. It is clear that the heads of the English Church were in doubt, whether the orders of Whittingham and Travers had been regularly conferred, even according to the Presbyterian system. Every dispassionate person, whatever may be his views of the abstract question, must admit that the Reformers and their successors, with those statesmen by whom the particular Act was framed, never intended that those persons should be comprehended under its provisions, who, on account of their objections to the ceremonies of the English Church, quitted their own country, and sought orders on the continent in Churches from which Episcopal government had, from necessity and not from choice, been removed. We say from necessity, because it is an indisputable fact, that not one of the Reformed Churches adopted Presbyterian government from choice. In every case, as was admitted at the time, they acted from necessity; and when our Reformers recognized the validity of their orders, they did so on the ground of that necessity under which the foreign Churches acted.

But it may be doubted whether the Act of the 13th Elizabeth contemplated any orders besides those of the Church of Rome, and those few individuals who had been ordained in exile during the reign of Queen Mary, when no other ordination than Presbyterian could be obtained. At that time there were many who had been ordained in the Church of Rome, and some, as we have stated, who had received Presbyterian orders in exile.

In the present day no churchman could wish to open the door to irregular ordinations. There are not many places where it can be pleaded that Episcopal government cannot be had; and it must be admitted that the continental churches, in which Episcopacy was not retained, present anything but a flourishing aspect to the observer. We speak of the spiritual condition of those churches. With the single exception of the Church of Scotland, which we regard with sentiments of the greatest veneration, there is not a single Presbyterian church which has not most lamentably fallen from its pristine vigour. The same scene is also presented in America: while in that very country the Episcopal Church is advancing in the affections of the people,

and increasing daily in the number of her members. We do not make these remarks disparagingly, but from a feeling of gratitude to Him who has preserved to us our Episcopal government; which we regard as that settled in the Apostolic age, and which is, in our opinion, not only warranted by God's word and agreeable to primitive practice, but is also best calculated to promote the interests of true religion and the welfare of immortal souls.

It may be asserted with confidence, that whatever can be proved to be of Apostolic origin is binding on the Christian world. We might instance the rite of confirmation, which, though not instituted by our Lord, was introduced by his Apostles, and has, therefore, ever been continued in the Church: and those who reject it, reject an ordinance of God. For 1,500 years, also, a Church never existed without Bishops. This has often been admitted by the opponents of Episcopacy. Nay, it must be admitted by any one who impartially considers the subject in all its bearings. In the sixteenth century some persons formed themselves into Churches without Bishops; and a similar course is still pursued by our dissenters. It is not for us to judge our brethren—to their own master they stand or fall; but we hesitate not to affirm, that to govern without Bishops is a departure from the practice of the Apostolic age. In the early days of the Church all the congregations in a city or district were comprehended in one Church, with a Bishop at its head; but according to the notions of Dissenters, every separate congregation is an independent Church. If a particular congregation, in the Apostolic age, had declared itself independent of the general body of the Church, the act would have been denominated schism. In our opinion, no one is justified in separating from a Church which retains the true doctrine, and is constituted according to the Apostolic model. This was the view taken by the Reformers: and to us it appears to be a sound one. Our own Church is constituted according to this model; and she retains in her Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy the doctrines of the Gospel. She commends herself, therefore, to the inhabitants of this land, and a heavy responsibility is incurred by those who knowingly slight her ordinances.

In the year 1593 Archbishop Whitgift issued "a Letter for contributions towards converted Priests." The clergy are still enjoined to confer with those papists who reside in their respective parishes; and in the reign of Elizabeth it appears that some priests came over from time to time to the Church of

England. The subject is thus stated in the Archbishop's letter:—

"Amongst such priests as came over from beyond the seas to pervert her Majesty's subjects both in religion and obedience, it pleaseth God by conference and other good means, to convert some to the truth; to whome alsoe it pleaseth her Majestie of her gracious goodness to grant pardon: and forasmuch as divers of them, being pardoned, are altogether destitute of maintenance, and driven to great extremitie through the same, I am moved with Christian pity and compassion, to pray your Lordship to move the better and wealthier sorte of the clergy within your diocese, to yelde some contributions towards their relief, until they may be otherwise provided for. Our adversaries plentifully rewarde and maintaine such as flye from us to them: and their priestes whilst they remayned papistes, lacked nothing; a great want of charity, therefore, and shame it were for us, after their conversion, to suffer them to begge or else to dye, or to revolt for lack."—(CARDWELL, vol. II. 25, 26.)

There were some remarkable instances of conversions from popery among the priests during the reign of Elizabeth. It was the custom to make the recantation at Paul's Cross, at the time of the public service, when vast numbers of people were usually assembled. Some of these recantations were published and are still to be found. A very scarce work, containing the recantation of two priests in the year 1588, is lying on our table.* In the epistle dedicatory to the Queen occurs the following passage:—

"Howe miserable we have been tossed on the sources of schismes and divisions, howe sore we have been overwhelmed with the waves of heresies, and overflowen with the floods of idolatrie and superstition, how unnaturallie we have been carried away from our dutiful allegiance, and how miraculously we have been brought home againe, your Majestie in viewing this short discourse that followeth, in part may understand."

It was for the maintenance of such men as these that the Archbishop issued his letter to the Bishops. Not only did the Bishops of the Anglican Church take care to furnish the means of subsistence to the converts from popery, but they also

* It has this title, "The recantations as they were severallie pronounced by William Tedder and Anthony Tyrrell (sometime two Seminarie Priests of the English Colledge in Rome, and nowe by the great mercie of Almighty God converted, unto the profession of the Gospel of Jesus Christ) at Paul's Crosse, the day and yeere as is mentioned in their severall Tytles of theyr recantations;—With an Epistle dedicatorie unto her Majestie, and their severall Prefaces unto the reader, contayning the causes that moved them to the same. At London, printed by John Charlewood and William Browne, Anno Domini, M.D.LXXXVIII."

afforded relief to the Protestants on the continent whenever they were in distress, though in matters connected with Church government there was a wide difference between them. On several occasions contributions were raised in England in aid of foreign Protestants. Thus, in the year 1603, when Geneva was besieged by the Duke of Savoy, with a view to the re-establishment of popery in that city, the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a Letter for the raising of contributions in their behalf:—

“The city of Geneva,” says the Archbishop, “of famous memory for the zeal the inhabitants have ever had to religion, and for harbouring of many persecuted for the same, as well of other nations as of this of England in time past, hath of late been put to great charges, by extraordinary occasions happened to them more than they were able to defray, and cannot preserve themselves from some imminent danger, except they be relieved by those their friends who for community of religion ought to hold the dangers of people so well affected to be their own cause.”

He then adds, that the Bishops should make the matter known to the clergy. His words are,—

“And that our pleasure is, they shall give order to the parsons, vicars, curates, and other incumbents of the several parishes in their dioceses, to make known so much to their parishioners at their assemblies on Sundays and holy-days.”—(CARDWELL, vol. II. 48, 49.)

It would be well if some provision could be made for those who come over from the Church of Rome; and who, in many cases, and especially in the case of priests, are entirely destitute of the means of support. The conduct of the Bishops and others in Elizabeth's time, in this respect, was one of the features of the times; it was one, too, which it would be well to imitate in the present day. To hold out a bribe, or to make promises of pecuniary support which might be construed into a bribe, would be highly improper; but to make such a provision as should relieve them from the apprehensions of poverty would be a wise and consistent measure.

When King James arrived in England he was petitioned by a large body of clergymen, who had been waiting in expectation of a change on his accession to the throne, to relax the terms of conformity; and, in short, to dispense with the observance of certain ceremonies which had been in use ever since the commencement of the Reformation. The petition was called the “Millenary Petition,” because it was said that one thousand signatures were attached to it, though the whole number did not amount to more than seven hundred and fifty.

They deemed it necessary to make a grand attack at James's accession; and as the King had been accustomed to Presbytery in Scotland, they fully expected that their demands would be complied with. They were soon undeceived: for James was really glad to be emancipated from the thralldom in which he had been held in his native country. He promised the ministers that a conference between the parties should be held, which took place at Hampton Court in January, 1603; and in the following March his Majesty issued a proclamation enforcing uniformity in the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The ensuing extract will show that the King was by no means disposed to yield to the Puritans, and will, at the same time, commend itself to the judgment of our readers by the good sense and sound arguments which pervade it. The King alludes to the "Millenary Petition," in which it was stated that there were certain errors both in doctrine and practice in the Church of England; and he adds,—

"Although we had no reason to presume that these things were so far amiss as was pretended, because we had seen the kingdom under that form of religion which by law was established in the reign of the late Queen, of famous memory, blessed with a peace and prosperity, both extraordinary and of many years continuance, (a strong evidence that God was therewith well pleased) yet because the importunity of the complainers was great, their affirmations vehement, and the zeal, wherewith the same did seem to be accompanied, very specious, we were moved thereby to make it an occasion to discharge that duty which is the chiefest of all kingly duties, that is, to settle the affairs of religion and the service of God before their own."

His Majesty proceeds to state that both parties were heard in the conference, and adds,—

"For we found mighty and vehement informations supported with so weak and slender proofs, as it appeared to us and our council, that there was no cause why any change should have been at all in that, which was most impugned, the Book of Common Prayer."

He then alludes to the alterations which had been made, and at last concludes by enforcing uniformity on all the clergy.

When the Parliament assembled the question of conformity was warmly debated; and, therefore, in the ensuing July the King issued another proclamation, enforcing obedience to the Act of Uniformity then in force. Both proclamations are inserted in Dr. Cardwell's pages.—(CARDWELL, vol II. 56-61.)

One of the most remarkable events of James's reign, and one for which it will ever be distinguished, was the present translation of the Holy Scriptures. In the reign of Henry VIII. the Bible had been translated, and set forth by authority; and

again in the reign of Elizabeth. The exiles at Geneva, during the reign of Queen Mary, had also effected a translation, which was invariably used by the Puritans for many years in preference to that which was made in the reign of Elizabeth, usually denominated the Bishops' Bible. At the Hampton Court Conference, the Puritan leader, Dr. Rainolds, proposed that a new translation should be effected. The merit of getting it accomplished is due entirely to the King; for it would not have been attempted, but for his own determination. His Majesty selected the individuals and assigned them their task. It is the fashion of some persons to speak contemptuously of James; but if we are to form an estimate of his character and attainments from the proceedings connected with the translation of the Bible, we must form a high opinion of his talents, as well as of the wisdom by which his course in the whole business was marked. Had he been less of a theologian, the translation would probably never have been effected. He made choice of fifty-four individuals well qualified for the work; and in the year 1611 it was published as an imperishable monument of their labours.

This translation has been in use from the period of its publication; for, as soon as it appeared, all others were tacitly laid aside. Many persons from that time down to the present, have cavilled at it; but who would consent to substitute in its room a new translation effected by men of our own age? It would be difficult to find a body of men so united in views, and so free from party zeal, as were the translators of our Bible. There may be errors, as in a work of such magnitude there must be, but they are comparatively of trivial consequence, and do not in any way affect important doctrines; and we feel convinced that the members of our Anglican Church, and many Dissenters too, would deem the substitution of another translation a calamity of no small magnitude.

Much has been said and written, at various periods, of the use of extempore prayer before sermon. It does not, however, appear that the practice was ever uniform. Before the Reformation, there was what was called the "Bidding Prayer," in which the officiating minister called upon the people to pray. In this prayer the names of the King, the Royal Family, the Pope, and the Cardinals were inserted; but when King Henry cast off the supremacy of Rome, the names of the Pontiff and his Cardinals were omitted. The prayer, as it was used in the beginning of the Reformation, may be found in Sparrow's Collections, forming a part of King Edward's Injunctions, A.D., 1547. At that time a clause was retained which en-

joined prayer for the dead, according to the practice of the Church of Rome. On Queen Elizabeth's accession, the prayer was altered, and the clause respecting the dead was changed into an expression of praise and thanksgiving for those who had departed in the faith. When the canons of 1603 were arranged by Convocation, the prayer was again altered in some few particulars. It is contained in the 55th canon. There are individuals who argue, that no other form can properly be used by any clergyman of the Anglican Church; yet few comparatively adopt it, except in cathedral churches, and on public occasions. It will, however, be seen on inquiry that the clergy are not strictly tied to this particular form. In the *first* place, the rubrics are silent as to the prayer to be used before sermon. As far, therefore, as the rubrics are concerned, the minister is under no restriction whatever. In the *second* place, the *canon* itself does not enjoin the absolute use of this particular prayer, as is evident from its commencement, namely,—“Before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer, in this form, *or to this effect*, as briefly as conveniently they may.” Provided then the clergy use a prayer to the same effect, there is no breach of the canon. In our opinion, the utmost latitude is granted by the clause which we have quoted.

In the year 1619, some of the clergy, in the prayer before sermon, omitted the royal titles of his Majesty, using merely the name of the King. The Archbishop of Canterbury, therefore, addressed a letter to the Bishops of his province on the subject. The following is an extract:—

“His Majesty, finding partly in his own chapel, but much more in his progresses abroad, that those who preach before him, do in their prayers use several and unfit forms, as sometimes naming King James, and nothing else, sometimes using uncertain words, in declaring him to be the ‘Defender of the Faith, and the like,’ for being supreme governor in causes both ecclesiastical and temporal, hath commanded me to direct my letters unto the Bishops of this province of Canterbury, to take some course for the reformation of the same; as, also, for the omitting to pray for Archbishops and Bishops, according to the form laudably used in the Church of England; whereunto his Majesty is the rather moved, because he cannot but conceive that these disorders are frequent in market towns and country parishes, when before his own royal presence there is so strange an omission.”—(CARDWELL, vol II., 133, 134.)

The Archbishop then alludes to the 55th canon, and intimates that the particular *form* there expressed is to be used without alteration. It is clear that the King wished to tie all

the clergy to the use of the particular form in the canon, against the express words of the canon itself. It is also evident, from the Archbishop's letter, that the Puritans took advantage of the latitude permitted by the canon and, actually omitted all mention of Archbishops and Bishops. Still the same irregularity prevailed after as well as before the letter of the Archbishop was issued. It does not appear, indeed, that any effect was produced by the letter, except, perhaps, in the royal chapels, where the preachers probably complied with his Majesty's directions.

Some years later, in 1636, Wren, Bishop of Norwich, endeavoured to bring all his clergy to the use of the exact *form* in the canon. In the "Orders and Directions," at his primary visitation, is the following:—"That the prayer before the sermon or homily, be exactly according to the 55th canon, 'mutatis mutandis,' only to move the people to pray in the words there prescribed, and no otherwise, unless he desire to interpose the names of the two Universities, and of a patron; and no prayer to be used in the pulpit after sermon, but the sermon to be concluded with 'Glory be to the Father, &c.,' and so come down from the pulpit."—(CARD. II. 201.) Wren was undoubtedly stretching his authority beyond its limits, for no Bishop had the power to set aside the canon, which certainly admitted a latitude, as far as the words of the prayers were concerned, and only enjoined the mention of certain persons and subjects. The clergy were of course at liberty, if they were so disposed, to use the exact words of the prayer in the canon; but they were not prohibited from using any other.

The reign of Charles I. was fruitful in theological controversies between the Bishops on the one hand, and the Puritans on the other; controversies of which every one knows the result. The King was brought to the block, and the Anglican Church was called to pass through a deep sea of trouble and affliction. We do not mean to say that the controversies to which we allude originated in this reign. They had their origin from a much earlier period; but it was in the reign of Charles I. that the fatal results were experienced.

Charles I. succeeded to the throne in 1625,* at the time when Laud was high in favour with King James. In the year 1628, a royal declaration was issued, the object of which

* There is a sermon extant, a copy of which is now before us, which was actually preached in the Court before Prince Charles, when his father was in dying circumstances. It bears this title:—"A heartie prayer in a needful time of trouble. The sermon preached at Theobalds, before his Majestie and the Lords of the Privie Council, an hour before the death of our

was to prevent all controversy on points of doctrine in the pulpit. It is enjoined in the declaration that the articles of religion should be subscribed by the clergy in the strict grammatical sense, no one being at liberty to put *his own sense or comment upon them*. At the same time, or at all events during the same year, a new edition of the Thirty-nine Articles was published, containing the disputed clause in the twentieth article. The Puritans immediately charged Laud with forging the clause in question. The clause is as follows:—"The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith."

On this point we cannot but conceive that Dr. Cardwell has done injustice to the memory of Laud. In a note to the royal declaration, he has the following remarks:—

"Bishop Laud was accused at his trial of having interpolated this edition of the Articles, by inserting a sentence of his own, at the beginning of the twentieth article, respecting the authority of the Church. There was some apparent foundation for the charge, inasmuch as the passage was not to be found in either the first edition or in most of those that followed it. But it certainly existed in others; and it was probably introduced by the Queen, after the Articles had been approved by the Convocation of 1562. We may admit, however, that we are indebted to Bishop Laud for the publicity and confirmation that the passage has subsequently obtained."—(CARDWELL, vol. II., 171.)

Now, we cannot think that there was even any *apparent foundation* for the charge against Laud of interpolating the edition of the Articles of 1628. The charge was not alleged against him for the first time at his trial, it was brought some years before by the Puritans. In the year 1637, Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne, were censured in the Star Chamber for their indecent attack on the hierarchy, and on individuals. Laud was present on the occasion, and as he was one of the parties most deeply implicated in the charge, he defended himself at great length on all the points respecting which he had been charged with innovations. His reply to the charge of

late Sovereign, King James, on Sunday, March 27th, by Dr. Price, Deane of Hereford, then in attendance, and now Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty. London, 1625." The sermon furnishes a curious instance of the worship always paid to the rising sun; for, after lamenting the state in which King James then was, which was known to be hopeless, the preacher proceeds in a somewhat flattering strain to compliment Prince Charles:—"Here is present a gracious dove (alluding to the prince), with an olive branch that shall bring comfortable news to our world, and the waters shall cease." But the fact, that the prince and the court attended divine service at such a time, is a convincing proof that the religious feelings of the age were very different from those of the present.

forging the disputed clause in the twentieth Article is so triumphant, that we shall make no apology for quoting it from the original speech, a copy of which is now before us,—

“ But then, my Lords, I must tell you, I hope to make it as clear as the day, that this forgery was not, that this clause mentioned was added by the Prelates to the Article, to gain power to the Church, and to serve our turns. But that that clause, in the beginning of the Article, was by these men, or at least by some of their faction, razed out, and this to weaken the just power of the Church, to serve *their* turns.”

In replying to the allegation that the clause was not to be found in the first editions of the Articles, he remarks—

“ But for the Articles made in the Queen’s time, and now in force, that this clause should not be found in English or Latin copies, till the year 1628, that it was set forth with the King’s declaration before it, is to me a miracle : but your Lordships shall see the falsehood and boldness of these men.

“ What ! is this affirmative clause in no copy, English or Latin, till the year 1628 ? Strange ! Why, my Lords, I have a copy of the Articles in English of the year 1612, and of the year 1605, and of the year 1593, and in Latin of the year 1563, which was one of the first printed copies, if not the first of all.

“ And in all these this affirmative clause for the Church’s power is in.”*

Laud also produced a document, under the hand of a public notary, to shew that the clause was to be found in the copy of the Articles embodied in the Acts of Convocation, of 1562, then preserved in St. Paul’s Church. These records were consumed in the fire of London, in 1666 : but there can be no doubt that the disputed clause existed in the Acts of Convocation.

It is certainly true that the clause was not found in several of the early editions : but this omission is more than over-balanced by the fact that it exists in the Acts of Convocation. In 1562 it was evidently subscribed by the Convocation. In this state did the matter remain until the year 1571, when many of the clergy endeavoured to avoid subscription, and when the Bishops laboured to enforce it. During that year the Articles were again printed in Latin and English, with the omission of the disputed clause. At that time the Puritan party appear to

* See “ A Speech delivered in the Star Chamber, on Wednesday, the 12th of June, MDCXXXVII, at the censure of *John Bastwick*, *Henry Burton*, and *William Pryn* : concerning pretended innovations in the Church. By the Most Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, his Grace. London, MDCXXXVII. P. 67-68.”

have been very powerful, both among the clergy and the laity: and it seems probable that under their influence the clause was left out. It does not appear that any dispute had then arisen respecting this clause, and the matter involved in it had not yet assumed that importance which was attached to it some years afterwards. Under such circumstances it was perfectly easy to omit the clause in re-printing the articles, without exciting observation. The subject had not attracted attention, and the omission was not noticed. There can be no doubt, whatever, that the clause existed in the copy subscribed by the Convocation of 1562. Its omission in various editions, both before and subsequent to 1571, is easily explained. The clause was not forged with a view to *oppress* the Puritans: but the omission was evidently designed to *strengthen* their cause. It is remarkable, that the paper produced in the Star Chamber was in existence in the year 1715, when Bennet published his able work on the Thirty-nine Articles. Whether it is still in existence we cannot determine: but we see no reason to doubt that such is the case. In 1715, the original document was in the possession of Colonel Hale, of Cottells, in the county of Wilts, a grandson of Lord Chief Justice Hale. It appears that this paper was seized by Prynne, under the authority of the House of Commons, and never returned to the Archbishop. Bennet has printed it in his valuable work.*

During the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I., the Church was greatly agitated by disputes respecting the situation of the Lord's table. In popish times the altar stood at the East end of the church, close to the wall. When altars were removed, tables were substituted: and by the second book of King Edward, they were to stand in the body of the church or in the chancel. It was at the option of the minister to place the table in either part of the church. The custom, however, was to place it in the chancel, and on communion days it was removed into some more convenient part. This is evident from Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, A.D. 1559; by which it was ordered—

“ That the holy table, in every church, be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered, as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed: at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort, within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the com-

* Bennet's Essay on the Thirty-Nine Articles, p. 167-168.

municants also more conveniently, and in more number communicate with the said minister. And after the communion done, from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before."

This was the practice in the reign of Elizabeth and her successors.

The rubric in King Edward's Second Book, and also in Queen Elizabeth's, enjoined, that the table should stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, leaving it to the option of the clergy or the ordinary. The injunction, therefore, and the rubric are somewhat different, the former fixing the position of the table, but enjoining its removal to a more convenient spot at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the latter leaving it with the minister and ecclesiastical authorities.

The reader of English history knows how vehemently the placing of the table at the East end of the chancel was opposed by the Puritans. Laud was charged with wishing to introduce popery. The civil wars broke out soon after 1640, while the disputes were raging, and Laud and the Bishops were overpowered. There was also another circumstance connected with the communion-table, at which the Puritans were highly offended, namely, the enclosing it with rails. After the civil wars had commenced, the soldiers of the parliamentary army used, wherever they came, to break down the rails and level the East end of the chancel with the rest of the church.

That Laud acted in opposition to the rubric, in insisting on the removal of the table to the East end, is a matter that cannot be questioned, for the position was left optional: but the Puritanical objections were most unreasonable, and the practice attempted to be enforced by Laud was, undoubtedly, far more becoming than that adopted by his opponents. In insisting, however, on the administration of the Lord's Supper at the table standing near the wall at the East end of the Chancel, he was acting in opposition to the eighty-second canon, which, with respect to the point in question, is the mere repetition of the Injunction of Elizabeth, already quoted. By the rubric, therefore, and by the canons, the matter was left undecided. Laud attempted to bring about uniformity: but just at the moment when the object was gained, the commotions of the country commenced, which issued in the murder of the King and the ruin of the Church.

In many places the table was placed, at the time of the celebration of the communion, at the East end of the chancel; but no express sentence from authority was obtained until the year 1640. In that year Charles assembled a Parliament, which was shortly dissolved. The Convocation always assembled with the Parliament: and when the latter was dissolved

the former ceased to exist. But, on this occasion, the King, by the exercise of his prerogative, continued the Convocation until it had enacted and passed a body of canons for the regulation of ecclesiastical discipline. These canons, by the next Parliament, were voted illegal; nor were they revived at the Restoration. In this Convocation Laud procured a settlement of the question respecting the position of the table according to his own views.

There is nothing in the canon then made to which churchmen in the present day can object, yet a loud outcry was raised against it at the time. And though in itself it is unobjectionable, yet it was most impolitic in Laud to attempt the alteration. The canon declares that the situation of the table was a matter of indifference, a position which can scarcely be questioned; and it would have been well if Laud had acted on this very principle, and made no new canon on the subject. For years that eminent prelate had been labouring to effect this particular object; and as soon as it was gained, he himself, and the Church over which he had presided, experienced a sad reverse.

In 1661, when the Liturgy was revised, the rubric respecting the situation of the table was permitted to remain unaltered. The canon also of 1604 is still in force. No regulation on the subject was framed: yet from the Restoration it has been the unvarying practice in all churches to place the table at the East end of the chancel, and to administer the elements at the rails. The very end, therefore, which Laud could not gain by all his efforts, has been secured by the moderation of those who revised the Liturgy in 1661. Had they altered the rubric and the canon, or had they insisted on placing the table at the East end of the church, it is more than probable that many would have been dissatisfied, and instead of uniformity, as is now the case, we might have been still involved in angry discussions respecting a mere trifle. The matter was wisely left undecided, and the consequence has been the most complete uniformity. For though the canon authorizing the removal of the table from the East end at the celebration of the communion still remains in force, and though the rubric still enjoins that the table shall stand either in the body of the church or in the chancel, yet there is not a parish in the kingdom in which it is not placed near the wall at the upper end of the chancel, or in which the elements are not administered at the rails. By leaving the matter indifferent, all controversy on the subject ceased; and in the present day no one is weak enough to imagine that the position of the table in the chancel can be regarded as an indication of popery. Such is the perversity of human nature,

that, if the canons of 1640 had been sanctioned at the Restoration or the Act of Uniformity, the old disputes would have been revived, and, in all probability, would have been kept alive to the present day.

It was during the ascendancy of Laud, that the attempt was made to place candles on the communion-table in our churches. We have already shewn that the Injunctions of King Edward are not binding, and that candles were not authorised by Act of Parliament in King Edward's second year. Since the appearance of our last number, the question has been agitated in various pamphlets, the writers being anxious to shew that the candles on our communion-tables are not only authorized but enjoined. An anonymous writer, in a pamphlet published at Leeds, endeavours to establish this point, that candles ought to be placed in all our churches. He quotes the rubric at the commencement of our Book of Common Prayer, which we have given in our former article : and argues that all ornaments in use in King Edward's second year are still lawful. There can be no doubt of the accuracy of such a conclusion ; but the writer cannot prove, nor can any one prove, that the candles *were* authorised by Act of Parliament. We cannot go again over the ground taken up in our former article, but we think it will be abundantly evident to those who have read it, that this writer's positions are untenable.

Before we conclude this subject, we may notice another error of a like nature into which Dr. Hook has fallen, in his able sermon, "A Call to Union."

In a note (p), at page 149, on the question of Reading-desks, is the following paragraph :—"In the Royal Injunctions still in force (Injune. 22, Edwd. VI. and 18 of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1559) it is enjoined 'that the Litany shall be sung or said in the middle of the church, before the chancel door, at a *low desk*,' commonly called the fald-stool. It is so styled in the coronation service." So far Dr. Hook. The language of King Edward's Injunctions is as follows : "The priests, with others of the quire, shall kneel in the midst of the church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the Litany, which is set forth in English." The words of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, A.D. 1559, are exactly similar : "The priest, with others of the quire, shall kneel in the midst of the church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the Litany, which is set forth in English."* We are fully convinced that Dr. Hook made the above statement inadvertently ; but, at the same time, we cannot conceive how he should have fallen into such an error, for a reference

* See "Cardwell's Documentary Annals," I. 15-187 ; or "Sparrow's Collections."

to "Sparrow's Collections" would have set him right. It will be seen that there is no mention in the Injunctions either of the "chancel," or a "low desk:" and, consequently, Dr. Hook's statement is unsupported by evidence.

We have now brought our remarks on these important topics to an end. The subjects are highly interesting. And our labours will not have been misapplied, if any of the members of our Church are induced to pay more attention, than with many has been usual, to the various matters of which, in this and a preceding article, we have attempted to furnish a summary.

ART. IX.—*An Apology for the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, M.A. London: Leslie. 1839.

2. *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland; or, Knox's Book of Common Order, with a Preface, &c.* By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, M.A. London: Leslie. 1840.

3. *Letter of the Very Rev. the Dean of Faculty.* London: Murray. 1840.

IN treating of the present anomalous position of the Scottish Establishment, it is not our intention to enter into the question of Apostolicity, to decide on the validity of Presbyterian orders, or to ascertain the Kirk's title to the appellation of Catholic Church. These are questions which are very delicate, and which we, as Anglican churchmen, are not called upon to solve. Those who out-Pusey Pusey, may, if they please, declare that the Scotch Establishment is no part of Christ's Church at all; that she has neither minister nor sacrament, nor any share in the covenant blessings. They may deny her ministers their legal title of "Reverend," and treat the whole communion "de haut en bas," as a body of heretics and schismatics, unworthy of a Christian's notice: with such we have little sympathy. On the other hand, we have still less with that loose and liberal portion of our clergy (a section we rejoice to know rapidly decreasing) who recognize as an authorized minister any well or ill-meaning person who is able to get "a call" from a congregation, and then dubs himself "Reverend;" who too often spends his time in railing against the illiberality, and hurling his anathemas against the pride and intolerance of those among the clergy who do not hail him as precisely on the same footing with themselves. These loose and liberal persons tell us that they prefer the Church of England, because, *in their judgment*, she is the most scriptural of "religious denominations;" and allowing, of course, the same latitude to others, justify the popery of the Papist and the schism of the Dissenter. While,

therefore, we do not offer any opinion as to the Apostolicity of the Kirk, we would remember that many great men* within our own communion recognize her and consider her, as the "Tracts for the Times" do the continental Churches—"an Episcopal Church, 'sede vacante.'"

Since then, as members of the English Church, we have no business in the matter, it is surely inexpedient to agitate a question which, however settled, must bring with it not a few difficulties. The wiser plan will be to let it remain undecided, and concede, *pendente lite*, the title Church of Scotland to the Presbyterian Establishment. We have observed that the wiser course will be to leave the question undecided, but it will be necessary to prove a proposition so apparently paradoxical. Whichever way we decide, we are beset with difficulties. If we acknowledge the Catholicity of the Scottish Church and the consequent validity of Presbyterian orders, we then deny the necessity of an Episcopate, even when it *may* be obtained, which is running considerably a-head of our Reformers; we open the door to an ever-increasing laxity of discipline, for if Presbytery be valid in Scotland, and in Scottish communions in England, it will be difficult to say why it should not be valid among Englishmen; and forthwith the Methodist conference, who stand upon *nearly the same* Ecclesiastical ground, will put in a claim which can hardly be denied. Again, if these things be permitted, who shall draw a line strong enough to keep out Congregationalism? These are some of the difficulties which beset us if we admit that the Scottish Establishment is a Catholic Church, and her ministers a lawfully ordained clergy. On the other hand, if we deny them these titles, we find ourselves in no less awkward a position, for, as the Presbyterian Kirk is established by the laws of the empire, and the Sovereign is bound by an oath to maintain it, the denial of its claims involves the position that the Monarch of a Christian country is by Christian laws enjoined to support a community of schismatics. We shall, therefore, leave the question, so far as *we* are concerned, without a decision; but, as a sister *Establishment*, no member of our Church can hesitate to acknowledge the Kirk; and its present difficulties cannot be contemplated without deep anxiety and unfeigned sympathy. We cannot, nor do we wish to deny that its moral effects have been most important. Whether we regard the well-educated population which Scotland has poured into every country of the world, or the moral glory which sits enthroned upon the hills of Caledonia, or the severe and well-regulated discipline to which

* e. g. Mr. Benson. "Tradition and Episcopacy," p. 110.

the Scottish clergy are subject, we must admit that in practical working, in national influence, the Scottish Kirk will be found far superior to any other non-Episcopal Establishment. We have but to look to the very able and highly interesting preface with which Mr. Cumming introduces the Liturgy of John Knox (a book which, *en passant*, be it said, ought to be read as a matter of ecclesiastical history, by every English clergyman); we have only to look at those remarks, and the tenor of that Liturgy, to perceive that laxity in point of discipline is by no means a fault to be attributed to the Kirk. We shall now give a brief sketch of the present form of Church government adopted in that Establishment, and then proceed to lay before our readers the circumstances which have led to its present anomalous position.

The lowest ecclesiastical judicature in the Scotch Church is the Kirk-session. It is comprised of the minister of the parish, as Moderator, and two or more respectable laymen, communicants and parishioners, who are his assessors, and form a jury in deciding on questions affecting the character of communicants. Some of these elders or churchwardens, are noblemen and highly-connected commoners, and others are farmers, lawyers, physicians, &c. The next superior court is the Presbytery. This court consist of the Presbyters of the diocese, or bounds over which it extends, and a certain number of the elders before alluded to, who take a part in those matters only which belong to them. The Presbytery exercises an Episcopal control over all the clergy within its jurisdiction. It ordains, inducts to benefices, and institutes to all ecclesiastical functions. The chair is occupied by one Presbyter, selected by his co-Presbyters, and by them constituted Moderator of the Presbytery. The Moderator used formerly to be perpetual. *Primus inter pares*. He is now chosen annually. There are eighty-two Presbyteries in the Kirk which meet at least every month. These Presbyteries are formed into sixteen Synods, which are courts of review, to lighten the labour of the General Assembly. They and the Moderators are both addressed "Very Reverend."

The General Assembly is comprised of representatives from each Presbytery. The Queen in person, or her Lord High Commissioner, occupies the throne in every Assembly and a clergyman selected by the previous Moderators is constituted its Moderator for one year, this being the highest dignity of the Establishment. In this Assembly is lodged the episcopacy and primacy of all Scotland. It is an Archbishop broken into fragments. Its decisions are final; it hears all ecclesiastical appeals, and confirms or reverses the sentences of inferior courts. All these courts are, of course, tied and bound

by the Articles and Canons of the Church. The General Assembly, or Supreme Synod, is addressed as "Right Reverend, and Right Honourable."

From the days of the Reformation, with very slight interruption, clergymen have been presented to benefices by the crown, nobility, and gentry, as patrons, and in the remaining cases by the Universities, the magistrates, or the communicants. During at least a century and a half, the rights of patrons have scarcely been disputed, except by a few of those restless clergymen who are ever in quest of some new grievance, on the back of which they may ride rough-shod to popularity and pre-eminence. The patrons have presented licentiates, whose status is precisely that of our deacons, and the Presbyteries, who exercise the functions of our Bishops, as bound by the original compact between Church and State, have examined the attainments, testimonials, and other endowments of the *presentee*, and if they have found him in all respects, as they found him on first trial, qualified, they admit him to priest's orders, and induct him to the benefice, if a licentiate, or induct simply if a clergyman previously fully ordained. Occasionally, where a clergyman very unpopular was presented to an incumbency in a manufacturing or commercial city, scenes of resistance and uproar have evolved from the *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*;* but in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases the settlements in vacant parishes have been most harmonious. Men of distinguished learning, great talent, and strict attention to their clerical duties, have been admitted to the pulpits of the Scotch Establishment. They may not have been men of what are called popular ability, nor does it appear that they have been at all avaricious of this sort of dignity; but the best portions of the theology of Scotland have emanated from their pens, and by them the most powerful impulse has been given to much of that improvement in ecclesiastical character and condition by which the Northern Establishment has been for some time signalized.

In the year 1834, ministers serving chapels of ease (who, prior to that period, were in the position occupied by ministers of proprietary chapels among us) were admitted as a sudden popular influx into the Church-court, and thereby invested with ecclesiastical jurisdiction; the now dominant party then felt that

* It has not unfrequently fallen out that political and party spirit had as much to do in such unseemly occurrences as religion or morality. And knowing, as we do, the many briefless barristers of the North who can be manufactured without delay into representative lay-elders, we may expect that men in such circumstances, if destitute of principle, will stimulate the feelings of the people in order to bring themselves out publicly.

they could carry in the General Assembly, or supreme court, a measure that would enlist in their favour the great mass of the common people, and do much to keep out thereafter any of the moderate or high-church* portion of the clergy from church ferment. A wild section, small in number and unimportant in influence, tried to agitate the repeal of patronage; which is, in plain terms, to deprive by force the patrons of their hereditary property. In this they, of course, failed. But they did not faint. They enrolled themselves into the "Anti-patronage Society," for the repeal of patronage; and finding repeal perfectly utopian, they proposed raising funds to buy up all the benefices of Scotland, and then hand them over to the people. The cannie Scots were willing enough to have the patronage, but were by no means disposed to pay for it. The Anti-patronage Society purchased *one living*, and then settled down on its lees, partly from its progress in good sense, and partly from that cohesive attraction which binds a Caledonian's sovereign to himself. That many of its members were men of disinterested zeal and real piety, it is alike just and pleasing to admit; but that they acted wisely or well it is imperative to deny.

A larger section of the clergy than these last, devised what they deemed an intermediate position—a point at which they thought the rights of patrons and the claims of parishioners might meet and act in harmony. This point is called, in the new nomenclature, "The Veto." Its working is as follows: The patron presents a licentiate (anglicè, one in Deacon's orders) to be tried by the Presbytery, and, if found qualified, to be ordained and inducted to the pastoral cure, temporal fruits, and all duties and emoluments connected with the benefice. If he is found unfit, or unlearned, or immoral, or in any tangible shape disqualified, the presentee may be, as he always has been in such circumstances, rejected, and the patron required by law to present another. But, according to the prescriptions of the "Veto," the presentee is not ushered by the patron to the court of his ecclesiastical superior, the Presbytery; but is sent into the pulpit of the parish to which he has been presented, there and then, for three successive Sundays, to preach, *not* as an ambassador of Christ, nor as a teacher of the people, *but as a candidate for votes—a humble suppliant for the approbation of his auditory*. If the people, through caprice or prejudice, or

* There are two parties in the Kirk called "high-church" and "low-church," or, otherwise, "moderate" and "wild." The former entertain Arminian sentiments; the latter are decided followers of the Genevan reformer.

political antipathy to the patron, reject him, that rejection terminates the presentation, ties up the hands of the Presbytery, and renders it obligatory on the patron to throw open the market, give them a more popular article, or that upon which they may have previously set their minds. This course is the most complete invasion of the "Headship of Christ," to use an ancient Scottish rallying cry, that ever was perpetrated. If the despotic power which thus commands the Presbytery not to touch the presentee, or try him, but leave him in the hands of the people, had been the *crown*, all Scotland would have reclaimed and resented; but because it is the *people*, all Scotland, at least, the lower classes of it, are perfectly delighted. The intrusion of a royal or aristocratic hand the masses would have resisted; but the intrusion of a thousand plebeian paws, overawing the Presbytery, deciding on the fitness and functions of the ministers, and, de facto, determining who shall and who shall not be the future clergy of the cures of Scotland, is thought so sacred a thing that none dare resist it. It is on this simple principle that the Rev. Dr. Muir, incumbent of St. Stephen's parish, the *St. George's, Hanover Square*, of Edinburgh, one of the most learned, distinguished, and spiritual men in the Kirk, has taken his position, and protested against the wild and tumultuous course of the dominant party in the General Assembly. He has, of course, been assailed by vulgar ignorance and popularity-hunting Presbyters, with storms of hisses, amid which the still small voice of righteousness was, nevertheless, heard beyond the limits of the northern capital. But, when the day of sobriety shall come, then will his name and his conduct be remembered with gratitude by the Presbytery of Scotland, though perhaps too late. We quote the following excellent remarks from his letter addressed to his congregation:—

"The Ministers are 'to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over whom the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers—to feed the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood'—'to preach Christ crucified'—to 'declare all the counsel of God,' and 'to speak the words of the Lord, whether men will hear or forbear'—to 'watch for souls, as they that must give an account'—to be 'the elders that rule well, and so be counted worthy of double honour'—and to 'commit the things which they have heard to faithful men, who shall be able to teach them also.' They, again, whom the Ministers of the Church are appointed to teach and superintend, are to 'suffer the word of exhortation'—to 'receive with meekness the ingrafted word'—not to 'become enemies to their teachers, because they tell them the truth'—'to know,' or acknowledge 'them which labour among them, and are over them in the Lord, and admonish them'—to 'obey those that have the rule over them, and to submit themselves,' and 'to pray for them.'"—p. 5.

These views are too scriptural, too independent for the Veto-men. The command of the minister of Christ to his people is, "submit yourselves"—according to our views and those of Dr. Muir; but the Veto-folk invert it, and say, the command of the people to the ministers of Christ is, "submit yourselves." For our parts, we are fully convinced that the Presbyterian Establishment of Scotland is at this moment hovering—tremblingly hovering—between two systems, antipodes to each other—Independency and Episcopacy. Into one or the other—we trust and hope the latter—Dr. Chalmers and the young men who follow him must bring her. The shelving-off has already begun. Several hundreds of the most respectable members of St. George's parish, Edinburgh, have seceded from that church, and either united themselves to Dr. Muir's, or become Episcopalians. The ultimate result of persisting in the rejecting of Lord Aberdeen's bill, and in clamouring for the Veto, will be that the educated and more respectable or exalted Scotsmen will join the Episcopal Church, and the lower classes will drag the Presbyterian platform into the thralldom and anarchy of wild Independency, there to repress all free speech in the clergy and sink all dignity in the Church. It is obvious that the Reformers, who were reared the nearest to Independency, and the furthest from the ancient forms, never dreamed of lodging in the hands of the people, parishioners or communicants, an irresponsible veto. Lord Aberdeen, a lay-elder of the Scotch Establishment, in a speech replete with argument, precedent, and apposite proofs, has shewn this incontestibly with regard to the Kirk. And now, if the members of that communion may have grace to humble themselves, and acknowledge that they have been in error, the whole controversy will settle down, and "dying martyrs and suffering pastors for the headship," and all that sort of similar rhodomontade, will be forgotten and forgiven, as other platform ebullitions usually are. We say, solemnly and deliberately, that Scotland now has it in her power to lift *many* of her clergy, to say the least, from the *Thorogood* class. To talk of leaving the funds to the patron, and rejecting his qualified presentee, Dr. Chalmers knows to be mere quibbling. It is only a sort of pious fraud. In the first place, the patron does *not* receive the emoluments, and is deprived of his right: and, in the next place, disobedience to the law, and surrender of chattels for conscience sake, is so truly parallel to the deeds and exploits of the church-rate "*martyrs*," that we cannot but deplore the unhappy blindness that has led to it.

* In the number for Monday, May 18, of the "*Record*," a religious newspaper published in London, there appeared a judicious leading article on the subject.

We do not expect that there will be a cessation of ecclesiastical hostilities among the dominant majority of the northern clergy. The very commencement of the last General Assembly gives painful proof of the irritated state of feeling. Instead of the former Moderator nominating his successor, and all the existing Moderators confirming it, Dr. Chalmers rose, and uttered a violent and injudicious philippic against Dr. Hill, who was the choice of the wonted authorities, and declared, in set terms, that he (Dr. Hill) was an ecclesiastical heretic, and unfit for the chair. The Doctor, of course, carried his intemperate unchristian motion by a very small majority. To gratify party pique, therefore, the usual order of procedure was set aside, and the Vetoists gave living evidence of the badness of their cause, by shewing that they were under the necessity of having recourse to disgraceful expedients to support it. Dr. Chalmers, with all his acknowledged genius and eloquence, has done more to un-church the Kirk of Scotland than the worst of its enemies. In the recent collision with the Dissenters, he sunk the *Church* in the *Establishment*. A district, a parochial teacher, and an endowment, was the Doctor's definition of "the Church!" In the present collision with the patrons and the state, he tries, and tries with too great success, to sink the *clergy* in the parishioners; and the whole structure of the Scotch Ecclesiastical Polity in a sea of turbid and uproarious democracy. Dr. Chalmers should never be suffered to lead. He is totally unfit for it: he ought to be under orders. The object of attack should be specified, and the Doctor commanded to charge; and notwithstanding a few unhappy gashes which he may deal around him on his own supporters, he will yet make disastrous havoc with the Philistines. But if he gets the command, he will attack a windmill with the heroism wherewith he assails an infidel; or dart into his own camp and hew down his own fences, rend his own colours, and slaughter his own friends with ruthless fury. The deplorable fact is however too obvious, that this gifted and eloquent man has been chosen by the dominant party of the Scotch clergy as their leader, and in their pursuit of his ignis fatuus hallucination they have plunged into more than Serbonian bog. If they try to extricate themselves on the right hand, the House of Lords, supported by the law of the land, repels them; if they try to escape on the left, they are met by the sneers of the Dissenters, and their own mortified pride overpowers them. The manly, Christian, *only* course is to repeal the obnoxious Veto Act, and then legally and constitutionally pursue what plan to their wisdom seems most expedient.

Those who do not choose to submit can secede, and those who will not secede must submit. It is of no use attempting to keep up "the reel of the Bogie" any longer. The Veto string must snap, and the performers pause.

The whole country gives painful evidence of the distracting effects of this Veto. The North of Aberdeenshire is a deep disgrace to the Scotch clergy. It cannot be new to the readers of this Review, far removed as many of them are from the more immediate arena of Scotch ecclesiastical politics, that seven parochial clergymen, the majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, have been suspended from the pastoral office, in consequence of their determination to proceed according to the form prescribed by the law of the land, the practice for nearly two hundred years before the Veto was heard of. If these men had acted on the Ecclesiastical or Veto law, they rendered themselves liable to intolerable fines and imprisonment. If they observed the laws of their country, as interpreted by all the civil tribunals, from the lowest up to the Lords, they became obnoxious to the spiritual penalties of their superiors. They determined to observe the civil law, believing in their consciences, as many thousands besides believe, that the Ecclesiastical Court had gone "ultra vires," and must necessarily succumb to the might of law and order. The consequence of this step was, that the commission of the General Assembly, which is the protracted executive of that body, and competent to carry out all the orders of the fountain-head of its jurisdiction, suspended at a blow the seven pastors, and sent seven others to supply their places. But the General Assembly had to learn a few useful lessons, the fruits of their own too severe and arbitrary measures. They have suspended the ministers from judicial functions, restraining them from conferring orders—intolerance we see can shew itself in Presbytery as keen as in Popery. It turned out, however, that in the eye of the law the rights of a parish incumbent were too sacred and secure to be thus summarily dealt with. The civil law interdicted, under the severest penalties, any ministers of the Established Church from touching the ecclesiastical rights of these clergy, entering the church or churchyard for the exercise of clerical function—nay, from any pastoral office within the parishes of the suspended clergy.

The General Assembly's commission sent clerical wasps to try the parishes, whether they would not raise a movement against their own ministers, and render the proceedings of the dominant party popular. But they signally failed. The intrusionists of the commission collected in meeting-houses,

and even popish chapels, the irreligious and restless of the population, and raised a momentary demonstration, which, anon, subsided into quiescence. The uncalled-for severity of the commission was universally felt, and a re-action in favour of the suspended clergy took place in every direction. The violent and vulgar of the intrusionists became fearfully unpopular, and in a month their more violent visitations enjoyed the following finale. Two of them, young men, came into a parish in the close carriage of a baronet who espoused the Veto, but such was the universal disapprobation of their proceedings, that neither school-room nor tavern could be had in the whole parish. *In extremis*, they covered a saw-pit with planks, and mounted this novel rostrum for the honour of the Veto. A considerable crowd of the parishioners from the poorer classes collected about the scene of action. On the two Vetoists assailing the parish minister, on no other ground than the fact of his reading his sermons, one of the peasants, provoked beyond bearing, threw an egg in the last stage of decay, and fixed its centrifugal and radiant contents, with marvellous precision, between the eye-brows of one of the parties. The impression was, in and on all senses, so intense, that the eloquent men became dumb, and the baronet's carriage wafted them away to tell the story of their success. Alas ! and is it come to this ! are rotten eggs substituted for arguments, and are there men in Scotland who merit such ratiocination ? It is mournful to hear of these failures ; but the guilt lies on those who, instead of remaining at home, preaching the Gospel, traverse the country, not to save souls and to establish vital truth, but to squabble for the illegal Veto. One of these violent partizans is the minister of a parish containing fourteen or fifteen thousand souls, and he has publicly declared his inability to discharge, as he would wish, its vast and solemn responsibilities. How does he find time for perambulating the country, and playing the part of a clerical Quixote ? Does he plead for more churches, in order that he may have more time to devote to the Veto ? Is church extension, so deeply to be desired, a convenience in his estimation, for enabling the Vetoists to intrude into other men's parishes, and mind every body's affairs save their own ? Such men, in such circumstances, furnish the enemies of church extension with a powerful weapon, and do irreparable mischief. On the suspended clergy of Strathbogie, we have read, with great care, a pamphlet, small in bulk, but masterly and unanswerable. We think we trace in it the pen of a Professor of King's College, Aberdeen, not from any peculiarity of style, but from the power and

terseness of its materials. It is well called "Some short and substantial reasons for suspending, *not* the ministers of the Church, but the agitation which the Church is systematically pursuing, in defiance of the laws, and in prejudice of the peace and morals of the people." The tenth reason is truly startling :—

"Because, more particularly, the unscrupulous ardour and activity with which this agitation is conducted, in the parishes of the seven suspended clergy, by clerical emissaries located there, with others sent by authority to their aid, is already making some impression, and cannot but, by and by, make still more, upon the unanimous feeling of respect, sympathy, and devoted attachment to their ministers at first pervading these parishes ; and not only will the foundation be thus laid of lasting *feuds in families and neighbourhoods*, but the more immediate consequences (in the opinion of sensible men resident in the Highland parishes involved in the suspension) will most probably be *violence, bloodshed, and loss of life*, notwithstanding the utmost efforts of the suspended clergy disinterestedly and anxiously exerted to preserve peace."

Indeed, every line is full of truth. To us it is a matter of unutterable amazement how such reasons as these, the pith of which we have given, and shall give, do not, in the Church-courts, and from the press, set the question at rest. We know well that the reply to our views will be at once, "Episcopalians cannot understand us of the North." Let the respondents speak softly. We, perhaps, know as much of the Scottish Kirk as the Vetoists. The Author of "The Short and Substantial Reasons" knows a vast deal more.

These arguments, in our mind, dispose of the whole question. The contumacy with which the clergy of Strathbogie are charged, is, in fact, the crime of the dominant party ; and if suspension is to be the punishment, let it be visited on Dr. Chalmers and his followers. We do not wonder at the results which every day arise from this state of things. Hundreds of the more respectable churchmen of the north are withdrawing from the Church of their fathers ; they are resolved not to set before their children examples of insubordination to the law of the land, instead of examples of whatsoever things are just, and lovely, and of good report.

Among many reasons that are abundantly fatal to the principle and policy of the Veto law, we wonder it has not more frequently occurred to all parties, that if a certain number of a congregation are to have an absolute veto in the introduction of a minister to a parish, and on the sole pretence that his ministrations are not profitable to their souls, it must necessarily

follow, that if on receiving a minister they find, ten years afterwards, that his preaching is not acceptable, they are at liberty to "veto" his continuance. The patron's act is not connected with any preference of the presentee's doctrine, or morals, or peculiarities of preaching. He presents a man declared by the competent tribunals to be one of the number qualified for such preferment, and thereby hands him over to the Presbytery to be examined, and, if found competent, to be inducted. The Presbytery receives the presentee, and inducts him on good grounds; and this same ecclesiastical court may deprive and degrade him on good grounds also. But, according to the Veto, the people admit or reject on no grounds or any grounds; they have power to receive the presentee, and power to reject. If they have this power transferred to them at the initiative, it is just and fair that they should retain it, just as did the Presbyters on the old system. And hence, if the Veto shall ever become law, the Scotch Establishment will sink into a mere puppet of the people, the *οἱ πολλοί*, receiving and dismissing ministers, as is the universal practice of the United States. The clergy, feeling their dependence on their hearers, will, if unprincipled men, spice and tinge their doctrines to the meridian they are placed in; and if men of undeniable principle, taught of God and faithful to the death, they will resign their flocks, and "labour with their hands," rather than accommodate their consciences and the "truth as it is in Jesus" to a restless mobocracy. The Kirk of Scotland may write "*Ichabod*" on her altars when she records the Veto. Her progress from that time will be downward. We hear of the popularity of this measure. Its popularity below a certain level every sensible man must anticipate—shopkeepers, who have risen from the stall to the counter, purse-proud vendmongers and petty lord-elders or deacons, who harrass their own minister, and would ride rough-shod over the whole clergy. Such men, ignorant, conceited, and incapable of distinguishing piety, save it be embodied in sanctimoniousness; who make long prayers, and give alms to be seen of men; and, under the shelter of such specious benevolence, backbite and traduce their superiors—must pant for the Veto as a new rod in their hands wherewith to chasten their teachers, a new and more permanent platform on which to display their own magnificence. They will have reached what they now long for as the acme of ecclesiastical grandeur, when venerable ministers shall have to fawn and flatter, or lose their bread; when a lord-elder's nod from his pew shall silence the preacher in the pulpit. It should not be disguised—the present struggle in Scotland is, whether the

clergy shall retain their present position of dignity, independence, and withal of arduous duty, or become the slaves and thralls of the purse-proud and most intolerant among the laity? It is true many of the clergy support the Veto. There may be suicides ecclesiastical as well as physical. We only hope these fifty champions of popular rights, so forgetful of popular duties, will be the first to champ the bit and feel the lash of lay despotism.

Our deliberate conviction is, that Presbytery is not able to stand against the tide and force of popular election. It is in its present constitution more mixed up with lay elements than it can well bear, and if more be added it must dissolve at once into Independency. The people are represented in the Church-courts by lay-elders, and if more of the same popular element is allowed to visit them, as it will, with overwhelming force, the moment the Veto orifice is formed, the Presbyterian structure must crumble into ruins, and out of the chaos the Episcopal Church of Scotland will gather fresh vigour, and the independent sects receive larger accessions to their numbers. The only Church that has stamina able to bear the pressure of popular power is the Episcopal. It would not be destroyed by it. Its hierarchy forms a fixed and permanent basis, which nothing but a moral earthquake can upheave. Episcopacy might throw open her parishes to popular elections, and from her lofty and stable position controul and regulate the turbulent masses; but Presbytery has no such vantage ground—it has already more than its share of popular elements: a fresh accession will upset the equilibrium, and precipitate the whole body into the gulf of Independency.

It seems now to be very generally felt by the keenest partizans of the Veto, that they have at last taken a false step. They ought to have first secured a legislative enactment, sanctioning the Veto, or the principles it involves, and thereafter to have passed the ecclesiastical act, rendering its observance obligatory. Whatever objections there may be to the results obtained, there could then have been none to the mode adopted of securing them. But to enact an ecclesiastical canon which not only evacuates the law of the country, but renders liable to forfeiture of civil rights those who see neither its equity or its expediency, and thereupon to demand the obeisance of the state, and the subordination of its rescripts to this, is not the part of sterling principle or high-minded honesty: it looks liker the movement of a jesuit than a churchman. That turbulent order is at this moment spread over the whole surface of society, and it may therefore be worth while to enquire

whether the Veto may not be indebted for a portion of its popularity to jesuit influence. Jesuits have, before now, taken orders in Protestant Churches, and we presume the Veto is not mighty enough to exclude the fraternity from the Scottish communion.

We are not of those who wish the overthrow of the Presbyterian Establishment. We should be glad to see a greater approximation to the Apostolic forms of our own Church. We would try to secure this, not by fiery anathemas, nor by uncourteous treatment, not by excision and unchurching, but by argument and by kindness.

It must be remembered that the question is not whether the ruin of Presbytery will *establish* Episcopacy; were this the case, we might rejoice at the Veto, and look forward with hope to its probable effects. The Episcopal Church may, and probably will, receive many accessions from the operation of this suicidal principle; but the Scottish Establishment will continue to be supported by Government as a Presbyterian body, when in virtual condition it will be so no longer. Its revenues and distinctions will remain: it will still be the authorised instructor of the people, but it will be the establishment of Independency: it will be the annihilation of all discipline, and the precedent will be given in the British Islands of an ecclesiastical democracy sanctioned and supported by the State. These considerations shew us that we are ourselves concerned in the fate of the Kirk. "Proximus ardet!" And are we to stand still and say nothing? Are we to look on while a learned, pious, and gifted ministry (apostolical or not, matters not in this case) are thrust by a popular movement from their position to make way for a mean and cringing set, who are willing to sacrifice the dignity of their Kirk, and the spiritual welfare of their country, to their own popularity, and the will of every vulgar spiritual demagogue?

- ART. X.—*The Hope of the Navy; or the True Source of Discipline and Efficiency, as set forth in the Articles of War.* By Rear-Admiral Sir JAHLEEL BRENTON, Bart., K.C.B., Lieut.-Governor of Greenwich Hospital. Nisbet.
2. *Extracts from Holy Writ, and various Authors; intended as Helps to Meditation and Prayer, principally intended for Soldiers and Seamen.* By Captain Sir NESSBIT J. WILLOUGHBY, R.N., C.B., K.C.H. London. 1840. Printed for gratuitous circulation.

3. *The Church in the Navy and Army.* Edinburgh : Innes.
4. *A Reverie of a Retired Officer on the Naval and Military Bible Society ; addressed to Red Coats and Blue Jackets.* London : Simpkins.
5. *An Appeal to the British Nation in behalf of our Sailors.* By Sir JAHLEEL BRENTON. Nisbet.

WE shall concern ourselves little with the literary merits of these unpretending volumes ; it is the subject they embrace which gives them their importance. They are samples, amongst others, of the steadily increasing interest which wise and zealous churchmen, lay as well as clerical, are taking in the spiritual welfare of the gallant defenders of our country, both by land and sea. The period is not very long gone by when it might too truly be said of our soldiers and sailors, that refuge failed them—no man cared for their souls. Though the spirit of Christian charity had woke from her slumbers, and had poured forth a loud note as from a trumpet, summoning men to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and though thousands and tens of thousands had responded to the call, so that the spiritual necessities of Jews and Turks, and Heretics and Infidels, of every description and of every degree, were engaging our sympathies and making large drafts upon our Christian benevolence, there was one field of labour,—and that constituting, strange to say, the very *glacis*—the fortification and defence, under God, of this great Christian nation—which was left almost overlooked and uncultivated. We sent missionaries out to Christianize the lands we had conquered, but we thought not of the souls of those who had conquered them for us. We cared not for the men without whom those missionaries could never have crossed the seas. There were two causes, says the excellent author of the “Retrospect,”* in another work of his† (alluding then more particularly to our seamen, though his words are no less applicable to our soldiers), which till very lately continued to operate in excluding them from the field of general improvement ; and these were, first, a most complete indifference, on the part of worldly men, as to their future joys and sorrows altogether ; and secondly, an astonishing degree of timidity, a strange want of lively faith and holy resolution, on the part of good men of every denomination. This unhappy “indifference and want of

* “The Retrospect ; or Review of Providential Mercies, with Anecdotes of various Characters, and an Address to Naval Officers. By Aliquis ; formerly a Lieutenant in the Royal Navy, and now a Minister in the Established Church.”

† The Ocean Spiritually Reviewed.

resolution," complained of by the author of "The Retrospect," is, we rejoice to say, diminishing every day. A growing necessity is felt that something more should be done, and that particularly as regards our seamen; and it gladdens us, moreover, to know that the case of our soldiers is likewise engaging the attention of those in authority. But, if good is to be done for either army or navy, the immediate question is, "How are we to go about it?" The no less immediate and necessary answer is, that the benefit can only be effected by a system of direct pastoral superintendence, brought more fully to bear upon both services. This is a work which peculiarly requires to be effected by Church and State working together, hand in hand. It is here that your voluntary principle must remain for ever at fault. It may build here and there a church or a chapel, where the neighbourhood is crowded or wealthy; it may, to a certain extent, distribute bibles, and it may circulate tracts;* but to bring a system of ministerial superintendence to bear upon our soldiers and sailors, collectively and individually, lies beyond its power. Even the Church, possessing, as she does within herself, the mighty advantages of organization and discipline; consisting, as she does, of a sacred imperium in imperio; presenting the sublime spectacle of a spiritual empire, a kingdom not of this world, which waves the sceptre of its benignant sway over the loftiest as well as the meanest—even the Church herself, so gifted and so constituted, has no means of bringing her mighty energies to bear upon the subject, without the assistance and co-operation of the State.

A bishop might send forth clergymen to preach to the soldiers in our garrisons, but who is to command their attendance on his ministrations? A bishop might nominate a priest to every ship in our navy, but who is to receive him on board, and allot him quarters and recognize him as an officer? Here the authority of the State must come in and co-operate with that of the Church. So that, while for the supply of our destitute villages we need look to the bishop alone, for the supply of our

* As regards the circulation of tracts in the navy, there is a standing Admiralty Order, that no tracts shall be received on board the ships of the fleet, except such as shall have been approved by the Senior-Chaplain of Greenwich Hospital. Attention to this order becomes more necessary than ever in the present day, when Socialists and others are busily employed in disseminating their pernicious doctrines, by means of this ready form of distribution. We would not, of course, be understood as classing with their vile productions the many excellent little publications which have issued from the pens of good men without the pale of the Church; but, as we can have no guarantee for soundness of doctrine in regard of those who reject creeds and articles of faith, as so many fetters upon "liberty of conscience," some such system of supervision becomes scarcely less necessary here also.

destitute garrisons and shipping, we must, of necessity, look also to the War Office and the Admiralty.

We shall present our readers with a rapid glance at the state of the army and navy, as regards the means hitherto provided for the spiritual instruction of our soldiers and seamen, throwing out such suggestions, for the improvement of the services in this respect, as may occur to us by the way.

As regards the army, however, we shall content ourselves, for the present, with chiefly stating its present deficiencies. Without bringing forward any particular plans for its improvement; only asserting, generally, that no remedy for its present condition can be of any avail, save such as shall recognize, as its leading principle, the placing the chaplains on a thoroughly efficient footing, without regard for contemptible pretences of economy, when "economy" is only another term for "the ruin of souls."

It is probable that chaplains were attached to the army at a very early period. History is full of notices of the attendance of ecclesiastics on military expeditions, generally as spiritual advisers and instructors—sometimes as attached to a particular office, when they received pay accordingly. Thus they were sometimes employed, in superstitious ages, in carrying sacred banners to inspire the troops with confidence. The standard of St. Cuthbert was so carried with the army of Edward into Scotland, and with that of the Earl of Surrey into Flodden Field. The bearer of the standard was a monk, named William de Gretham, who received pay accordingly, as we learn from the wardrobe account of Edward I., quoted by Grose.—(MIL. Antiq. vol. II., p. 53.)*

It does not, however, appear that any thing was done towards attaching them permanently to our military establishments till the reign of William III.; indeed it was impossible that anything could have been done till then towards placing them on a permanent footing, since we date from that reign the first origin of a standing army. We may say, then, that the existence of regular military chaplains was coeval with that of the army as at present constituted. They were originally attached to every regiment, and continued to be so till the end of the seven years' war. It appears, however, that the system of regimental chaplains did not answer, at least in time of peace, and garrison

* *Domino Willmo de Gretham monacho Dunolm, sequenti regem cum vexilla Sancti Cuthberti in guerra Scocie, anno presentis pro expensis suis, a 8 die Julii, usque 24 diem Augusti, utroque computato, per 35 dies morandó in exercitu regis ac etiam pro expensis suis per 4 dies sequentes redeundo versus Dunolm, de licentia regis.*

chaplains were substituted in their stead. Wherever there was a garrison, there it was understood that there should be a settled resident chaplain, who would thus be independent of the wanderings of the various regiments, which pass from time to time under his care. It is a lamentable fact, however, that at the present time, in all England and Ireland, where there are 106 military stations, there are only *six* chaplains actually on duty! And in the colonies, which are thirty-seven in number, comprising amongst them at least *sixty* or *seventy* principal and permanent stations, besides a number of others of more or less importance, we have only eleven chaplains scattered over the whole! But the case is still worse, as regards the existence of places in which the troops may assemble for the performance of divine worship. In England, except at a very few stations, such as Chelsea Hospital, Chatham, the Tower, Portsmouth, and Woolwich, there is no regular place for the performance of divine worship whatsoever. In Scotland, the two castles of Edinburgh and Stirling are provided, indeed, with Presbyterian chaplains, under the terms of the Act of Union; but, at the former station, there is no chapel for the use of the troops, and at the latter there was a chapel, but it has been converted into an armoury! Windsor itself, the very seat and head-quarters of royalty, affords a lamentable case in point, to exhibit the deficiency of any regular means of exercising ministerial superintendence over our troops. There are never less than between 1,000 and 2,000 men quartered, and yet this large body has no place of worship provided for them, and their only service is one of about ten minutes in length, performed in the *open air* every other Sunday, and that by no regular chaplain, but by one of the clergy from the town. Yet the attendance of the regular appointed local clergy upon the troops of their several districts is the miserable "legal fiction" by which it is *assumed* that the lack of regular chaplains is every where supplied. We have, indeed, known those, and one in particular, the curate of a large manufacturing town-parish in Lancashire, who managed, amidst all their other heavy duties, to lecture regularly to the troops at the barracks, and likewise to visit those in hospital;*

* It is an interesting fact, that though by far the great majority of the troops in this case were Roman Catholics, they gladly availed themselves of the services of this excellent young clergyman, and, there is reason to hope, were materially benefited by them. Indeed, generally speaking, it would be impossible to find any body of men more capable of being wrought upon by religious instruction, from a regular clergyman, than our soldiers and sailors. From their habits and manner of life, they are not likely to be deep politicians in matters either spiritual or secular. They are, therefore, tolerably free from

but in many cases, that they should receive such superintendence is *physically* impossible. Take the case of Manchester, for instance, where there are a large number of troops always quartered. The clergy there are overweighted with duty already. And how is a man to attend to the military when he has thousands upon thousands of regular parishioners under his charge already? We say nothing of all this additional duty being expected to be done without remuneration, as it is pretty well known now, in spite of the ravings of interested demagogues and scribblers of sedition, that the clergy are the men, taking them generally, who do by far the most amount of work for the least pay, and who are always the readiest to meet the heavy demands, whether for time or money, or gratuitous labour, which are continually being made upon them. We say nothing, therefore, of the duty having to be done gratuitously; the great body of the parochial clergy would cheerfully attend to it if they could, but they cannot—the thing is capable of being proved to be out of their power. Two thousand souls, or at the most three thousand, are by the best judges considered the extreme limit of the number which a clergyman can properly attend to. What then is he to do when frequently, having already a much larger number than that quoted above, one or two thousand more are thrown in upon him in addition? And even supposing him to be able to notice them in some measure during the week, as we have shown to have been done by some, in the teeth of all difficulty, there remains yet still another thing which renders their proper spiritual superintendence out of the question. The clergyman cannot divide himself on the Sunday; he cannot have two, or perhaps, as in some cases, three full services, besides the frequent routine of marriages, funerals, churchings, and christenings, at his church, and *then* a separate service for the troops in addition. And if it be said, why not at once march them to the parish church to attend divine service with the rest, the simple answer is, it may be possible to do so here and there—and where it is practicable we believe that this is done, but, generally speaking, the parish church will not hold them, it is already occupied by the parishioners, so that in every way the military are cut off from any thing like the certainty of religious superintendence, so long as such superintendence is not regularly provided for them.

all forms of schism, save that of the Romish; and where such is their persuasion, they have no difficulty in obtaining permission to avail themselves of the services of a Romish dissenting chapel. The above quoted instance seems however to prove, that in many cases, even soldiers professing the Romish faith, would gladly attend on the ministrations of a regular clergyman of the Church wherever the opportunity was afforded them.

It has been asked before now, What is the Chaplain-General about? Why does not he interfere to endeavour to provide some remedy for this state of things? The truth of the matter is, the army has *no* Chaplain-General. The duty is *supposed* to be performed by the principal chaplain to the forces, but this gentleman has too much on his hands already to attend to the matter properly, however great his good-will. And, indeed, whatever good he may feel inclined to do, he has not, under the present state of things, the power.

But bad as things are in peace, they were, if possible, worse during the war. We are assured by a gentleman who was present during the whole of the Peninsular campaign, that he never heard divine service performed but twice during the space of two whole years. And not only were the dead buried without one word pronounced over them of that transcendently sublime and solemn service with which the Church has enjoined that the ashes of her departed children shall be committed to the dust; but what was still more affecting, because it concerned the living, the hospitals became seminaries of the most revolting vice, instead of being, as they might have been, under proper ministerial superintendence, so many schools of righteousness—and all for want of a proper supply of chaplains. Again, to return to the deficiencies of the army at the present time, the soldiers' wives are an important class of the military community, who may exercise unspeakable influence over their husbands, whether for good or for evil. But, with all allowance for the many bright and admirable exceptions, how often are they found setting an example of drunkenness instead of sobriety—the leaders of riot instead of the guardians of order and decency? This state of things might be wonderfully remedied: under God's blessing, could these women be brought within the range of the superintendence of a kind and zealous clergyman. Drunkenness would, under his remonstrances, give place to sobriety; and riot and debauchery yield to religion and good order. It is gratifying, however, to know, in the mean time, that in spite of every deficiency, the moral character of the army has risen rapidly of late years, giving hereby the earnest of what it might become, were the proper means only taken to provide it with spiritual instruction. Indeed, it is wonderful, all things considered, that the army is so good and so moral as it is; much credit must, of course, be due to its officers. Offences of every kind have diminished, and punishment has, of course, diminished in proportion.

We are happy in being enabled to state that there are some signs at present observable, which seem to betoken a disposition

on the part of those in authority to aid in improving the moral condition of the soldier. We delight in being able to notice these, writing as we do under the influence of no political motives, and joyfully, therefore, tendering our meed of applause where it appears to be merited, whilst we no less reserve to ourselves the right of censuring freely where censure is due. Some of the omens from which we augur favourably are these: Two or three useful little books, calculated to benefit the army, have lately been written by various well-intentioned non-commissioned officers and privates, under such titles as, "Voice to a Recruit," &c. These have been taken up, and their circulation encouraged: the expense of publishing being borne by the Government. About 80 stations, moreover, are now furnished with libraries. A proportion of the books are of a religious character, and were selected for the purpose under the inspection of the Rev. G. R. Gleig, Chaplain at Chelsea Hospital. Parliament voted 2,000*l.* for this laudable object.*

Promotion from the ranks is likewise more frequent than it used to be; which seems to exhibit an anxiety, on the part of the authorities, to raise the character of the army by holding out a premium for good behaviour. All these, we repeat, are favourable omens, and we have reason to believe that they are only an earnest of improvements to be introduced on a much larger scale, in which full regard shall be had to a proper provision for the spiritual interests of the army generally. As we indulge this hope, we shall rest content at having exhibited the fearful deficiency of regular pastoral care under which the army labours at present, without entering minutely into any suggestions as to particular plans for its improvement. If we are right in our conjecture that something is on the eve of being done, we shall have hereafter an opportunity of noticing the merits or defects of any plans which may be proposed, when we may possibly recur again to the subject. Till then we content ourselves in taking our stand upon the broad assertion which we

* Another most praiseworthy regulation is, that all regiments are now provided with schoolmasters. There is a sergeant appointed in every regiment, who receives additional pay for performing the duties of schoolmaster. The arrangement of the regimental schools would be admirable in all its parts, were they only placed under the fostering care of the clergyman, the natural protector of the rising generation. The Duke of York's school for soldiers' orphans was likewise a valuable boon conferred upon the army by him who bore the well-earned title of the soldier's friend. Nothing can exceed the perfection of its internal arrangements; and of the chaplain, the Rev. G. Clark, it is impossible to speak in too high terms of praise. The present number of boys is about 360; they did amount to 800, but the peace, and various other causes, have combined to diminish them. They furnish, as may be supposed, the very best recruits for the army.

have already made, that no plan can be brought forward with any effect for the good of the army unless it involve, as a leading principle, the placing of chaplains on an efficient footing.

We are not hazarding this assertion upon any hastily adopted or unsupported assumptions. We are borne out in our opinion by the highest military authority of this or perhaps any other age. The Duke of Wellington has been known to declare that, during the Peninsular war, a well-organised system of chaplains would have been his most efficient police, and equal to the physical gain of a fresh division, by the moral force which they would have superadded to the army. That great man and true patriot, who appears to allow no subject of practical benefit to his country to escape the searching glance of his eagle ken, has given, amongst a series of his letters recently published, a remarkable testimony to the interest with which he regards the matter.* The letter to which we refer is to be found in Vol. VII. of "The Wellington Despatches," p. 230; and it is aptly quoted by Sir Jahleel Brenton ("Hope of the Navy," p. 267) in disproof of the assertion so frequently made, that the Duke of Wellington had always shewn himself decidedly averse to the professors of religion, and lost no opportunity of discountenancing them:—

"To Sir H. Calvert.

"Cartaxo, 6th Feb., 1811.

"My dear General—I believe that you have attended a good deal

* A further proof of this has been given in the late appointment, by the noble Duke, of the Rev. Henry Melvill to the chaplaincy of the Tower. The appointment in itself is worth but little, still the Duke's conferring it as he has done, shews clearly his anxiety at once to do honour to high moral worth and genius, and to impart to the troops, where he has it in his power, the blessing of a spiritual superintendence of the highest order. The nomination, by his Grace's influence, of the author of the "Subaltern," the Rev. George Gleig, to a similar situation at Chelsea Hospital, is another case in point; and the manner in which the duties of his situation are performed by the rev. gentleman in question, afford the best testimony to the noble Duke's discrimination. The regulation services at Chelsea are a morning and afternoon service on the Sunday, and prayers on the Wednesdays and Fridays. The afternoon service is a voluntary one on the part of the men, and the excellent attendance proves the willingness of the soldier to be instructed when provided with the means. Mr. Gleig, however, by no means confines himself to the duties required of him by law. No one feels more deeply than he, that it is possible for a clergyman to perform these with the utmost punctuality, and yet be but an unfaithful priest at the best. Accordingly, amongst other things, he is diligent in watching over the sick inmates of the hospital, generally from sixty to eighty in number; and for an hour before the service on Sunday, during a greater part of the year, he regularly catechises and examines in the Scriptures the children of all ranks connected with the establishment, who amount to about seventy in number: a duty which the parents see performed with delight and thankfulness, and on the benefit of which to the children all comment is needless. Would that all our military stations were similarly served, and in like manner privileged.

to the establishment of chaplains in the army, upon which I am now about to trouble you.

"Notwithstanding all that has been done upon the subject, with a view to making their situation such as to induce respectable persons to accept of them, I fear that they are not yet sufficiently advantageous to ensure the object. I believe the income, while they are employed abroad, to be sufficiently good; but that of retired chaplains after service is not; and the period of service required of them is too long. You will observe, that a man can hardly be eligible to be an army chaplain till he is six or eight-and-twenty, after an expensive education: and it can hardly be said that the pay of a retired chaplain, at thirty-six years of age, is what a respectable person would have acquired, if he had followed any other line of the clerical profession besides the army. In my opinion, the period of service ought to be reduced from ten to six years; but they ought to be years of service, without leave of absence, excepting on account of health; and the pay of the retired chaplain ought to be augmented. My reason for making these suggestions is, that really we do not get respectable men for the service.* I have one excellent young man in this army, Mr. Briscall, who is attached to head-quarters, and who has never been absent from his duty: but I have not yet seen another who has not applied and made a pitiable case for leave of absence immediately after his arrival: and excepting Mr. Dennis, at Lisbon, who was absent all last year, I believe Mr. Briscall is the only chaplain doing duty.

"I am very anxious upon this subject, not only from the desire which every man must have, that so many persons as there are in this army should have the advantage of religious instruction, *but from a knowledge that it is the greatest support and aid to military discipline and order.*

"It has, besides, come to my knowledge, that Methodism is spreading very fast in the army.† There are two or three Methodist meetings in the town (Cartaxo), of which one is in the guards. The men meet in the evening and sing psalms, and, I believe, a serjeant (Stephens) now and then gives them a sermon.

"Mr. Briscall has an eye upon these transactions, and would give me notice were they growing into anything which ought to be put a

* Why might it not be made a rule, that those who performed their duties properly, should be presented, after a certain period of service, to some of the Crown livings, which might be placed at the disposal of the War Office for the purpose? It would be only endowing the army with so many benefices, out of the immense patronage of the Crown, which might be succeeded to in the same manner as those in the gift of Colleges are from College Fellowships. This would ensure the entrance of respectable men into the service. The danger is that certain "no-patronage" Governments might manage to make such patronage the mere reward of political subserviency, whilst talent, merit, and arduous faithful service, remained overlooked and unrewarded.

† This by no means interferes with our previous assertion, that soldiers and sailors are not generally inclined to sectarian views. It only proves that many of them feel the want of the means of grace, and ought to be provided with those means.

stop to ; and the respectability of his character and conduct has given him an influence over these people, which will prevent them from going wrong. These meetings likewise prevail in other parts of the army. In the ninth regiment there is one at which two officers attend, Lieut. — and Dr. —, and the commander of the regiment has not been able to prevail upon them to discontinue this practice. Here, and in similar instances, we want the assistance of a respectable clergyman. By his personal influence and advice, and by that of true religion, he would moderate the zeal and enthusiasm of these gentlemen ; and would prevent these meetings from becoming mischievous, if he did not prevail upon them to discontinue them entirely.

" This is the only mode in which, in my opinion, we can touch these meetings. The meeting of soldiers in their cantonments, to sing psalms, or hear a sermon read by one of their comrades, is, in the abstract, perfectly innocent, and it is a better way of spending their time than many others to which they are addicted ; but it may become otherwise :* and yet, till the abuse has made some progress, the commanding officer would have no knowledge of it, nor could he interfere. Even, at last, his interference must be guided with discretion, otherwise it will do more harm than good ; and it can in no case be so effectual as that of a respectable clergyman.

" I wish, therefore, you would turn your mind a little more to this subject, and arrange some plan by which the number of respectable and efficient clergymen in the army may be increased.

(Signed)

" WELLINGTON."

So far, then, as Sir Jahleel observes, from any appearance of

* The Duke here alludes, not to the possibility of religion doing any harm to these men, as a thing *per se*, but to notions detrimental to the interests of the service, and of the country, getting into the heads of good men with more zeal than knowledge ; who when not properly instructed, might be led under certain circumstances, by their religion to disobey orders, which might appear to them improper, such as regarded fighting on Sunday, &c., when the necessity of the case, and the welfare of the country required it. There is a good deal of truth lurking beneath the somewhat unceremonious reply of the first-lieutenant of one of his Majesty's ships, to the midshipman who had been inattentive to some order, or had not executed it in the manner required. The oburgation was going on in no very measured language, seasoned with what Mrs. Malaprop calls " a choice derangement of epitaphs," and a mast-heading began to loom in no very dim or distant perspective, when " Please, sir, I thought,"—interrupted the lieutenant-stricken offender. What the luckless penitent " thought " can never be transmitted for the illumination of posterity, as the defence was cut short by the enraged first-lieutenant, with " Thought, sir, thought—I'll have you to know that you've no right to think upon his Majesty's quarter-deck. Way aloft with you, sir, to the main-top-gallant cross-trees, and stay there till you are wanted down again." The fact is, that on all questions of immediate service the less subordinates think for themselves the better—their business is to obey orders, not to canvass them. It would scarcely do to have men engaged in a theological discussion, as to whether it were proper to fight or no, when ordered into the field on a sudden attack of the enemy. To their honour, however, be it spoken, our religious men have generally shown themselves the best and bravest of their profession. Of this fact both services have afforded the most brilliant examples, one or two of which we shall notice further on.

VOL. VIII.—O

a wish to discourage religious conduct amongst the troops under his command, this most distinguished and experienced commander comes forward, in the letter just quoted, with the most open and candid declaration, that, from his own knowledge, the advantage of religious instruction "is the greatest support and aid to military discipline and order." The Duke felt and expressed the apprehension that there was a possibility that religious meetings might, under the influence of ignorant and fanatical teachers, degenerate into what might become injurious, rather than beneficial, to the great cause they intended to advocate; and all who have the interests of true religion at heart, must experience the same jealousy upon a subject of such paramount importance. At the same time, we must guard against involving, in a sweeping censure, all those truly God-fearing and pious individuals, many of them the very salt of the earth, who, through want of judgment or better instruction, may have fallen in with the usages of sectarian forms of worship; our business should be rather to provide them with instruction than to censure them—and this, it is clear, was the feeling entertained by the Duke when he wrote to General Calvert upon the subject.

Before we turn to the Navy, we shall give a brief extract of the admirable arrangement of the East India Company's service, in the matter of chaplains, which appear to hold up an example, which we can only fervently desire to see followed as regards all our Colonies. We should premise, however, that no chaplain, at least of the Church of England, performs duty in India but those of the regular army establishment.

Chaplains for the British territory in India are appointed by the East India Company, there being none in India belonging to her Majesty's service: the chaplains belonging to the honourable Company doing duty, both for the Queen's and the Company's troops. They are sent, in certain proportions, to each Presidency, and distributed to the different stations of the army by the Governors of each Presidency, at the suggestion and recommendation, *generally*, of the Bishop: there being one at each Presidency. Chaplains on their arrival in India draw the regimental pay, allowances, and batta of a major of infantry, rather more than 700*l.* per annum. The *senior-chaplains at the Presidency*, generally from three to four, are expressly appointed by the Governor, and draw the pay, &c., of a lieutenant-colonel upon *full* batta, about 1,150*l.* per annum; they are only under the immediate controul of the Archdeacon, Bishop, and Governor, who is supreme in the ecclesiastical arrangements. Their duties are the same as of clergymen in general,

and they are expected to visit the regimental hospitals, &c., at their respective stations. Chaplains are allowed a furlough to Europe, after seven years actual service in India, and draw the pay, *without* batta, of a major. If ill-health should prevent their returning, they are (on certain certificates) allowed to retire on (we believe) 180*l.* per annum. All chaplains, after fifteen years actual service in India, are entitled to retire upon the *pay* of a major, or 300*l.* per annum. All stations in India where there are European troops, as well as some civil stations, are provided with churches regularly consecrated by the Bishop, and built by the East India Company. We believe, in fact, that the regulations respecting the ecclesiastical establishment in India are as perfect, in all respects, as they possibly can be made. The army in India is infinitely better provided with the means of religious instruction at present by the excellent arrangement of the late Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of York, than it was in former years. All regiments are provided with a schoolmaster, who is paid and mustered as schoolmaster-sergeant; according to the strength of the school he is allowed assistants from the ranks, selected by the commanding-officer, under whose control alone regimental schools are. The chaplains are expected to visit them, and to examine the scholars at their respective stations; and any suggestions which they may make for their benefit, are generally attended to by the commanding-officer. Chaplains are, moreover, authorized to lend and issue religious books, &c., to soldiers, their wives and children, from a liberal store placed at his disposal by Government, for which he passes his receipt through the Archdeacon and Bishop, to the Secretary to Government.

It is quite unnecessary to comment upon the delightful contrast which this state of things presents, as compared with the condition of the army elsewhere. We can only express a hope that something may speedily be done towards following so admirable an example.

There are few more painful subjects of contemplation to the Christian philanthropist than the thought of how little has been done for the eternal welfare of those who carry, from their very profession, their lives in their hand—who must be ready at any moment to lay them down at their country's call. We too often suffer ourselves to be carried away by tales of arms and deeds of valour, till we forget that the field of fame has been the scene of the sudden departure of numberless myriads of spirits to their awful account. That from amidst the wildest excitement and the hottest fervour of the passions, and the tu-

multuous perturbation of the whole human fabric, they have retired in a moment to the still solemnities of the separate state—have entered upon the dread certainty of a condition eternally fixed.

It is not because death has been met with unflinching bravery and firm daring of soul, that we are, therefore, to forget that he is still the King of Terrors. We would have men ready to meet him, but it should be with the heroism of Christians, not with the savage recklessness of wild beasts. We know that excitements manifold have power, under sudden circumstances, to remove, indeed, the fear of death, so that the timid fights like a hero, and the brave as though he were immortal. Were we to walk amidst the camp-fires on the solemn eve of battle, and had we access to the inmost feelings of the armed companies who cluster around them far and wide, we should know, by the occasional quicker beating of many an anxious heart, that there was something like nervous depression at work in the breasts of not a few amongst the groups who were, nevertheless, prepared to quit them like men on the morrow—as the fond remembrances of home, and country, and relations, came crowding and thronging, and the thought would force itself in, that before another sun had set the soldier's course might be run. But were we to shift the scene, and go forth amidst the host when the strife had begun, and the first blood had been drawn, and the first roar of cannon had bellowed along the plain, we should find no depression in the hearts of those who rushed to the onset; we should see the flashing eye, and the expanded nostril, and the firm-set limb, amidst scenes of fell carnage, and wounds and massacre, as steel clashed fierce against steel, and the death-shot came hissing and crashing over the plain. We should behold the fearless rush of martial manhood into "the imminent deadly breach," where blood is poured out like water, and Death looks forth grim and ghastly from amidst heaps of mutilated corpses and shattered limbs, and the thick sulphureous clouds which gather around the earthquake of strife: and there would be no gesture of fear, no sign of dismay, no shadow of terror upon the visages of the mighty. The fear of death is lost amidst the fierce excitement of the strife, and the grim-visaged king, in all his ghastliest forms, is fearlessly defied. But there is only one stimulus, one ground-work of assurance, which can safely remove the fear, and for ever—one principle of triumph which can, indeed, prevail, to swallow up death in victory: and that not the wild excitement of the moment which blinds men to danger, but the possession of that faith, and with it that holiness without which no man shall see

the Lord. Unsupported by this principle, though a man in worldly phrase may fall like a hero, in the sober sadness of reality, he dies as the fool dies. We have been dazzled by the halo of victory which sheds its light upon the warrior's parting hour, till we have too much forgotten that he has a soul to be lost or saved; and that mere military glory, or the mere devotedness of patriotism, can avail the naked spirit nothing when it comes to stand in the presence of its God.

It is high time that this illusion should be done away; that now, when a protracted peace affords time for sober reflection, we should turn a philanthropic eye upon the condition of those who must fight our country's battles, should we have occasion, which Providence avert, to be again engaged in war. The case of the army calls loudly for our sympathising interference. We have shown that it can scarcely be more destitute of the means of spiritual superintendence than it is, and we fervently trust that something may be done to remedy this destitution.

[We are unwillingly compelled to defer the remainder of this article, relating to *Naval Chaplains*, till our next number.] Ed.

ART XI.—*The Life of Thomas Burgess, D.D., F.R.S., F.A.S., &c. &c. &c., late Lord Bishop of Salisbury.* By JOHN L. HARFORD, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S. London: Longman and Co. 1840. Pp. xvi. 557. 8vo.

THIS well-written memoir is one of the most pleasing, as well as instructive volumes of Christian and Ecclesiastical biography which of late years has issued from the press. The Christian reader will peruse it with delight and gratification, and ecclesiastics of every rank may read it for their guidance and instruction. It presents, in the closing scene of the pious and venerable Bishop's life, a beautiful and practical illustration of Addison's dying remark: "See! in what peace a Christian can die!" At the same time, the elevation of Dr. Burgess to the Episcopate exhibits an additional instance (if further instances were wanting in the present bench of Bishops) that humble origin does not exclude men of learning and piety from the highest dignities of the Anglican Church. Having been honoured with the friendship of the departed Prelate, and entrusted by him with the disposition of his papers and correspondence, Mr. Harford possessed singular advantages for composing an authentic and interesting memoir of his revered friend: who (he truly remarks) "to deep and extensive erudi-

tion, united a firm and inflexible adherence to his convictions of Christian duty, both in public and in private life, accompanied with deep humility and guileless simplicity of mind and manners."

Dr. Thomas Burgess, late Bishop of Salisbury, was born Nov. 18, 1756, at Odiham, near Basingstoke, in Hampshire. His father was a respectable grocer of that place; who, together with his mother, early imbued their children with religious principles. Nor were their parental labours thrown away upon them, and least of all upon the subject of Mr. Harford's memoir. The good seed thus early cast into his mind, germinated, by the divine blessing, at a very early period; and through the restraining influence of "the fear of the Lord," so justly denominated by the sacred penman as "the beginning of wisdom," he passed through the dangerous ordeal of a public school and of college, uncontaminated. Having received the rudiments of a classical education at Odiham, he went, in 1768, to Winchester School, under the tuition of Dr. Joseph Warton; and thence, in 1775, he was elected to a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Here he assiduously applied himself to his studies, the fruits of which appeared in no long time, first in his learned and accurate edition of Burton's *Pentalogia*, published in 1778, while he was yet an undergraduate; and afterwards in his erudite and equally accurate edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica*, in 1781. The publication of these two works introduced him to many of the most distinguished scholars and critics on the continent, as well as at home; and, among the latter, to the learned Mr. Tyrwhitt, who, in 1780, commenced a generous friendship with Mr. Burgess, which terminated only with his life. In order to enable him to prosecute his studies, Mr. T. prevailed on him to accept pecuniary aid as his "curate" at the University, in a manner equally honourable to both parties. Mr. Harford has enriched this part of his memoir with many of their letters, which must be read with pleasure. In 1780 Mr. Burgess gained the Chancellor's prize-medal for an Essay on the Study of Antiquities, which soon passed into a second edition. Mr. Harford characterizes this essay as "the production of an elegant and ingenious mind, richly stored with classic images, and glowing with sensibility to the sublime and the beautiful in nature and art;" the style of which, though in some parts incorrect, is in general accurate and elegant.

Passing over the interesting literary correspondence of Mr. Burgess with Lord Monboddo, Mr. Tyrwhitt, and the Rev. Dr. Vincent, afterwards Dean of Westminster, we find him ap-

pointed college tutor in the summer of 1782, which he held till 1791; in 1783 he was elected fellow of Corpus, and in the following year he was ordained. His attention was now turned to sacred studies, and he gradually imbibed deep and serious views of divine truth. At, or soon after, this time, he devoted himself with much assiduity to the study of Hebrew. Among his college pupils, who subsequently rose to distinguished eminence, were the late Lord Tenterden and Mr. Roberts, the biographer of Mrs. Hannah More and author of some well-known treatises on the law of property, in which he has happily united elegance of style with profound legal investigation. A few months after he had held his tutorship, Mr. Burgess found himself in such easy circumstances, that he no longer needed the kind aid which his friend, Mr. Tyrwhitt, had prevailed on him to accept under the denomination of his "curate." "Their correspondence," however, "continued to be frequent; and Mr. Tyrwhitt, while he watched his proceedings with an interest akin to paternal anxiety, hailed with the sincerest delight his advancing progress in the path of literary and professional investigation." (p. 88.)

We are now to contemplate Mr. Burgess in a more public point of view. In the course of the year 1785, Bishop Barrington (then of Salisbury, afterwards of Durham) selected him to be his chaplain; and Mr. Harford has paid a just tribute of respect to the memory of that munificent and pious Prelate and elegant scholar. We are tempted to give the following anecdotes of Bishop Barrington, as they tend to place his character in a most noble point of view:—

In all his ecclesiastical appointments "it was his wish and intention to select individuals whose talents, principles, and attainments best fitted them for the particular situations to which he appointed them. Nor were his regards confined to men eminent for learning or genius in their sacred profession. He loved and valued Christian piety for its own sake: and the humblest curate that came within his notice, in whose character and conduct he traced anything of the image of that Redeemer, in whom alone was his trust, was sure to attract his esteem, and, if needful, his support. Party names with him weighed nothing, principle and conduct were every thing.

"His firmness of purpose, in adhering to these principles of action, was sometimes put to a severe test, but his presence of mind, united to a winning courtesy, never failed him on any such occasion. It was his constant maxim of conduct, and he often gave it in counsel to patrons, never to make promises, nor even to encourage expectations. He was one day accosted at court by Queen Charlotte, for whom he entertained an affectionate and dutiful respect, as follows: 'My Lord, I have a favour to ask of you. The living of —, in your disposal, is, I understand, now vacant, and I shall be greatly obliged if you will bestow it upon Mr. —, for whom I feel much interested.' The Bishop, in

the most courteous manner, signified, in reply, his desire to meet any wish expressed by her Majesty; but added, that he felt bound to apprise her of the rule which he had invariably laid down to himself with respect to all such applications. He had no sooner given utterance to it, than the Queen stopped further explanation by exclaiming, 'My Lord, I will not say a word more: and I beg that no wish of mine may lead you to violate so golden a rule.'

"But though he never made promises, he always had a list, known only to God and himself, of the names of those who, he had reason to believe, were most deserving of advancement and patronage.

"The following incident illustrates at once his unbending principle and great kindness. A near relation of his, who had been gay and thoughtless, applied to him for advice about taking orders, adding, that he could venture to say, a great improvement had recently taken place in his principles and habits. The Bishop received him kindly; but before he would enter upon the subject, stipulated for the most frank and explicit replies to any questions he should put to him. In this way an acknowledgment was obtained, that he was influenced by a hope that, as his relation, he would ordain and provide for him. And it further came out, that his wishes were fixed upon a particular living then vacant, or on the point of becoming so, the value of which was about 500*l.* per annum. 'And would this amount of income,' inquired the Bishop, 'entirely satisfy your wishes?' He eagerly replied in the affirmative. 'You shall have it, then,' replied his Lordship; 'but not in the way you propose. I cannot reconcile it to my sense of duty to ordain you, but I will immediately transfer as much stock into your name as will produce an annual sum equal to that which you have declared to be the acme of your wishes, and may it prove to you all that you anticipate,'" pp. 390-392.

But to return to Mr. Burgess:—

"About the time that Mr. Burgess entered on the duties of his new office, Bishop Barrington was much occupied by a benevolent project for extending the system of Sunday schools throughout the diocese of Salisbury. Sunday schools were at this time novelties. Hannah More, and Mr. Raikes of Gloucester, were the first persons who gave a powerful impulse to them, an impulse which has since been felt throughout Great Britain, has extended itself even among the continental nations, and been felt across the Atlantic. The system furnishes a simple and a most efficacious instrument for diffusing the blessings of Christian instruction among the rising generation. The Bishop of Salisbury found in his chaplain a very able coadjutor in the prosecution of his benevolent intentions. No better evidence can be adduced of the good fruit of Mr. Burgess's sacred studies, and of the growth of the religious principle in his mind, than the zeal with which he henceforth exerted himself to promote the Christian education of the children of the labouring classes, and to train them up in provident principles and habits. Few objects were nearer to his heart than these throughout the remainder of his life. To his first assiduous exertions, therefore, of this description, for the good of his fellow-crea-

tures, his biographer may be allowed to recur with peculiar interest. Suitable books for Sunday schools were at this time extremely rare, and Mr. Burgess took great pains to supply the deficiency. Hence originated the *Salisbury Spelling-book*, the first of a long list of useful little publications which he compiled from time to time, at different periods of his life, for the Christian instruction of the ignorant and simple. It is a very useful manual, into which, in addition to the elements of spelling and reading, he introduced many pretty and edifying stories told in the simplest language; a series of scriptural lessons: and, finally, the Church catechism. It quickly obtained a circulation extending far beyond the bounds of the diocese for which it was specially intended, as appeared by a letter from Messrs. Rivington addressed to the author, and requesting his directions, when they were about to print a new edition.

"This book was quickly followed by another, consisting of Exercises adapted to the Spelling-book, in which children were carried further on in religious knowledge. Then finding that something still more elementary than these was desirable for very young children, he compiled two more manuals—one entitled 'The Child's First Book;' the other, 'The Child's First Lessons in Religion,' with short prayers for children to learn by heart before they are taught to read.

"Unpretending as these little works were, the detail and accuracy which they required cost him no small pains, and subtracted much of his attention from learned studies. But the hope of doing good rendered the employment delightful and attractive." pp. 103-105.

We reluctantly pass over Mr. Burgess's literary visit to the continent, and his correspondence with the eminent scholars who were his contemporaries, that we may notice the publication, in 1789, of his anonymous "Considerations on the Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade, upon the grounds of Religious, Natural, and Political Duty." This is justly characterised by his biographer as "a powerful and eloquent exposure of the futility of the arguments advanced in support, not merely of West Indian slavery, but of slavery itself." It is remarkable that his proposition, in the year 1789, was exactly accordant with the measure finally adopted by the British Parliament. He argues, not for an immediate emancipation, but for an act of the legislature, which should prohibit all further importation of slaves into the British Islands from the coasts of Africa, and which should abolish slavery itself after a limited period; and proposes to prepare, in the meantime, for this final measure by the Christian instruction of the black population.

In 1790 Mr. Burgess published his valuable sermon, which had been preached before the University of Oxford, on "the Divinity of Christ proved from his own declarations, attested and interpreted by his living witnesses, the Jews." Of this sermon Mr. Harford has given a concise abstract, for which we

must refer to his volume, as well as for the correspondence to which it gave rise. In the same year he united with many other members of Convocation of the University of Oxford, in an unsuccessful effort to procure the conferring of the honorary degree of LL.D. on Mr. Burke, in testimony of the high sense they entertained of the eminent services which he had rendered to our religious and civil constitution by his able and disinterested vindication of their true principles. Bishop Barrington being translated from the see of Salisbury to that of Durham, Mr. Burgess resigned his tutorship at Corpus, and accompanied his friend and patron to Durham; who, in 1794, conferred a prebendal stall upon his chaplain, and in the following year presented him to the living of Winston, a beautiful and retired village a few miles distant from Durham. Here he had ample scope for employing his fine talents for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, in the active discharge of pastoral and parochial duties.

"He divided his time of residence pretty equally between Durham and Winston, though the peaceful and pastoral delights of the latter increasingly riveted his affections. The income of the living was moderate, from 200*l.* to 300*l.* per annum, and the population did not exceed a few hundreds. They very soon became animated by feelings of cordial respect and affection for their new rector, in whom they found a kind and liberal friend, a Christian teacher and benefactor, and a bright example of personal piety. He set himself to do good among them, in conjunction with his curate, not only by a zealous discharge of his public duties, but also by visiting his people in their respective homes and cottages, and there conversing with them in the true spirit of a Christian pastor. Among many other modes of administering to their temporal comfort, he constantly kept a large assortment of blankets and other useful articles in his house, to lend out among the sick or necessitous.

"Throughout life his heart melted upon an appeal to his benevolence; and he felt, not only for the trials of the more indigent poor, but for those, also, to which industrious men in respectable situations are occasionally liable, from peculiar vicissitudes. For example, one of his parishioners, a tenant of the Bridgewater estate, was in arrear for rent for a considerable sum; a distress was about to be levied on his effects, when he generously interfered, and advanced the whole amount, consenting to receive it back by degrees, in hay, cheese, and such articles.

"His pastoral care was specially extended to those of his flock who were precluded, by distance or bodily infirmity, from attending the services of the parish church. Two cottages situated in suitable quarters of the parish were fixed upon, where such persons assembled at a specified hour every Sunday, and Mr. Burgess and his curate divided the duty of meeting them, and of ministering to their spiritual edification. Sir Thomas Bernard, a name proverbial in the annals of

benevolence, was so much pleased with 'The Poor Man's Club,' as this plan of instruction was called at Winston, that he gave an account of it in one of his publications, and it thus became the germ of those extra-official ministrations, which, under the name of cottage lectures, and, in most instances, with episcopal sanction, are doing extensive good in many of our populous parishes, destitute of due church accommodation. Disinterested efforts like these, on the part of the clergy, are now of ordinary occurrence; and while they essentially promote the important ends of the Christian ministry, they win the affections of the people, and cement the bonds of their attachment to the Established Church, its ministers, and offices.

"The instruction of the children and of the youth of his parish was another branch of pastoral duty to which Mr. Burgess assiduously devoted much of his time and thoughts: and many were the little cheap publications on religious subjects which he printed at Durham for their benefit." p.p. 176, 177.

In 1799 Mr. Burgess married a lady, with whom he lived in uninterrupted harmony and happiness during the long period of forty years. Mr. Harford has recorded the following incident, which shows that, however attentive he had been to his learned studies and his religious duties, he was but little skilled in domestic affairs:—

"On the day of their marriage, the Bishop drove into Durham from Auckland Castle to unite their hands, and it was arranged that they should go to Winston Parsonage immediately after the ceremony. Conjecturing that his chaplain might probably have forgotten to furnish his larder suitably to the occasion, the kind and thoughtful Prelate had sent over an ample supply of delicacies to await their arrival. Just as they were about to drive off, he amused himself by probing the fact. 'You have, no doubt, taken good care to provide every thing in the best manner for Mrs. Burgess's reception at Winston?' The chaplain started at the question, and was obliged to own that really it had never occurred to him. He was at once relieved from his embarrassment, and had reason, as on many former occasions, to recognise in his diocesan his good genius.

"But while he thus occasionally lost sight of what referred to personal comfort or gratification, Mrs. Burgess was most pleasingly impressed, on settling at Winston, by the minute attention which she found that her husband had been in the habit of paying to the comfort and relief of the poorer classes of his parishioners."—p. 199.

In 1803, Mr. Addington, then prime minister, who had been his contemporary, both at Winchester and at Oxford, recommended him for the see of St. David's to the venerable George III., who approved of the recommendation.

The feelings of Mr. Burgess, on "perusing Mr. Addington's letter were mingled and conflicting. The tribute of respect and esteem which it conveyed, from a distinguished and upright statesman,

writing from an accurate knowledge of the nature and circumstances of his career, both public and private, could not but highly gratify him ; his conscience, also, testified that he had in no way courted this flattering offer. It came to him unsought and unexpected. But his reflecting mind could not be dazzled into a forgetfulness of the great responsibility attendant upon the episcopal office, nor of the onerous public duties which its acceptance would impose upon *him*, whose cherished wish had been the quiet life of a country clergyman. His first impression, therefore, was to decline the offer ; and, in allusion to this fact, he said to a friend, a short time only before his death, ‘ I had not lost the feelings which prompted me, some years before, to request permission to retire from Durham into a less public station.’ Further reflection, however, outweighed his scruples ; he felt convinced, that should he return a negative reply, the friends whose judgment he most valued would unite in condemning his decision ; and this conviction, together with the spontaneous nature of the minister’s offer, and the anticipations which his letter threw out of his increased usefulness, finally induced him to return an affirmative, and, of course, a grateful answer.”

Thus, unexpectedly, was realized the wish which, we happen to know, Mr. Burgess in the simplicity of his heart had expressed six or seven years before as the highest object of his ambition, that he might some day or other be a “ poor Welsh Bishop,” (Welsh Bishopricks were but poor Bishopricks at that period, and were commonly regarded as stepping-stones to richer sees,) and devote his time and attention to the spiritual welfare of his diocese. He now applied all the powers of his well-informed mind to the most important objects which could possibly engage a Bishop’s attention. He found the diocese of St. David’s in a most dilapidated state ;—the ecclesiastical edifices were generally in a ruinous condition ; many of the clergy were incompetently educated, from various causes. These evils were gradually and effectually remedied : but the noblest of all his efforts, perhaps, was his princely subscriptions towards building St. David’s College, at Lampeter, the site for which, covering three acres of land, was generously given by Mr. Harford and his brothers. The proceedings relating to this great and splendid undertaking necessarily form a large and interesting portion of Mr. Harford’s volume, to which we must refer our readers, who cannot fail to be deeply interested in them. The institution of the St. David’s Church Union Society, was another of the good Bishop’s plans for the improvement of the clergy ; and, in order to impress them with just views of the importance and responsibility of the pastoral office, he proposed some remarkable subjects for prize essays. With reference to one of these, Mr. (now the Rev. C.) Wilks’s “ Essay on the Signs of Conversion and Unconversion in Ministers of the Church,”

Mr. Harford has preserved an interesting anecdote, which we are tempted to transcribe :—

“ The Essay of Mr. Wilks,” he says, “ treated this delicate subject with so much practical discrimination, and touched in so impressive a manner on the responsibility, dignity, and importance of the clerical office, that the Bishop, to the close of his life, was in the habit of keeping a large number of copies of it in his house, and of presenting them to clergymen after ordination. An abridgment of this Essay was also one of the exercises frequently required from candidates for Orders.

“ The following letter, addressed, in the year 1815, by the Bishop to G. Marriott, Esq., will be read with interest in reference to this subject :—

“ Dear Sir,—I have unsealed my letter for the sake of giving you an anecdote respecting the usefulness of a book, which you, I remember, approved on its first publication,—‘ The Essay on the Signs of Conversion and Unconversion in Ministers of the Church.’ The Bishop of Gloucester,* previously to his late ordination, required of his candidates, who were six, that they should read and give him an account of the Essay. On the day of examination, only *five* candidates presented themselves. A letter was delivered to the Bishop from the absentee, declaring himself no longer a candidate. My correspondent adds, ‘ You will be able to judge of, and to participate in, the feelings of the Bishop when he read the young man’s letter, in which he expresses the deepest sense of gratitude to the Bishop for his kindness in putting the book into his hands, which had been, happily, the means of saving him from plunging into the sacred office inconsiderately, and without any adequate impression of its importance, and of the responsibility attached to it, and declining being considered as a candidate.’ My correspondent adds, ‘ If no other advantage had arisen from the St. David’s Society than that little Tract, the Society would have ample cause of satisfaction and congratulation.’

“ I am, dear Sir, your’s, very faithfully,
(pp. 242, 243.) “ T. ST. DAVID’S.”

As a member of the House of Lords, Bishop Burgess, on religious grounds, uniformly opposed the demands made by the papists; and he also vindicated our Protestant faith by various learned publications, which he either wrote or edited. Of these publications Mr. Harford has given an account;† and he has printed in an appendix, the masterly letter addressed in print, in 1836,

* Bishop Huntingford.

† One little publication appears to have escaped Mr. Harford’s notice : it is intitled, “ Romanism condemned by the Church of Rome ; or, Popery convicted of Idolatry, Apostacy, and Anti-christianity, from its own highest authorities. By the Rev. John Panke, formerly Rector of North Tidworth, in the county of Wilts. Salisbury : J. Hearn, jun., Market-place, 1835.” 8vo. This volume was printed at the expense of Bishop Burgess, by whom we believe it was edited, and from whom we received our copy. It was first published in 1618, and it contains numerous testimonies out of the writings of Gregory, surnamed the Great, sometime Bishop of Rome, and of Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, shewing their agreement with Protestants against the *new* doctrines of the Romish Church.

by the Lord Bishop of Salisbury (to which see he had been translated in 1825), to Viscount Melbourne, who, in a speech on moving the second reading of the Irish Church Bill, had ignorantly, as well as erroneously, asserted that "the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are fundamentally the same with those of the Church of England."

"It is due (Mr. Harford remarks) to Lord Melbourne to add, that he returned a very courteous and respectful answer to this letter, but waved any attempt to grapple with its arguments."—(p. 509.) Most probably, because he could not refute them.* Subsequent events have but too clearly proved the truth of the bishop's all but prophetic apprehensions, that any concessions made to papists, instead of allaying, if granted, the existing differences between protestants and papists, would have (as in truth they have had) a directly contrary effect, by stirring up in the latter ulterior objects of ambition, and by producing an increase of demand and rivalry, forming new and perpetual sources of future contention.

Not long before the Bishop printed his letter to Lord Melbourne, he addressed the following letter to the clergy of his diocese; which, as it appears to have been unknown to Mr. Harford, both that gentleman and our readers (we trust) will not be displeased to find preserved in our pages. It was occasioned by the suggestion, which had been made by the author of the "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures," for a ter-centenary commemoration of the completion of the first entire English version of the Bible, on the fourth of October, 1535; and as the fourth of October, 1835, fell on a Sunday (when the second morning lesson and one of the psalms of the day were singularly appropriate), that suggestion was voluntarily adopted on that day, in Great Britain, in Ireland also, and in some parts of France and the United States of America :—

"TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF SALISBURY.

"Reverend Brethren,—Most cordially and readily do I assent to the justice of the call, which has been lately made upon us, as ministers and members of the Church of England, by some zealous friends of the Reformation, to co-operate with the members of a foreign Protestant Church, in expressing our gratitude to God, by commemorating the blessing of the Reformation, and especially by distinguishing and celebrating, on our part, the completion and publication of the first English translation of the Bible, on the fourth of October, 1535. There is another day which eminently deserves to be celebrated by us as the BIRTHDAY of our Reformation—the day on which was com-

* "He that's convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still."—*Butler's Hudibras.*

pleted our emancipation by law from the foreign supremacy of the Pope—the twentieth of March, 1534, on which the Act passed by which the power of the Pope in this country, and all connexion with Rome, were for ever abolished, and the supremacy of the King, in all causes, ecclesiastical and civil, within his dominions, was re-established. I say re-established, because before the eleventh century, the English sovereigns rejected with indignation the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome. The supremacy of the King you are required, by the first canon of our Church, publicly to declare and maintain to your congregations four times at least in every year. The fourth of October, therefore, and the twentieth of March, may well be appropriated as two of the days for our observance of the canon. There are, besides, two other days in the year distinguished by events intimately connected with the great Protestant interests of our country, and consecrated in our Liturgy by special forms of prayer—the *King's accession* and the *fifth of November*;—the former relating to the commencement of our present Protestant dynasty, and the latter to an indelible evidence of the hostility of popery to our Protestant religion and establishment—that religion and establishment which the three powers of the realm are bound by the most solemn oaths and engagements to protect and maintain.* There are, therefore, *four* days in the year on which you may so fulfil the first canon of our Church, as to combine with the observance of it, in your discourses, subjects of the deepest interest to us, as Christians, as Protestants, as ministers of the Church of England, and as loyal subjects, by inculcating to your congregations the truth of Scripture and the vanity of traditions—the deliverance of our country from a popish dynasty—the inextinguishable hostility of Popery to our national institutions—and the emancipation of our Church from subjection to a foreign Bishop, and from the idolatry, apostacy, and anti-christianity of his Church.

“The Protestant religion, the Protestant people, and Protestant wealth (whatever papists may assert), are still the ascendants in the empire; and nothing but indifference to the blessings we enjoy in the profession of our Protestant faith, and ingratitude to that gracious Providence which restored it in the sixteenth century, can ever enable Popery to regain in this country the domination which it once possessed here. Let commemorative and Conservative associations multiply; be active, co-operative, and united, and it never will regain it. Let us be true to the Protestant faith that we profess, and faithful to the Church of which we are members, and ‘the gates of hell,’ with all the powers of darkness, of error, and idolatry, ‘shall not prevail against it,’ or its doctrine.

“I am, Reverend Brethren,

“Your faithful friend, and brother in Christ,

“Palace, Salisbury, July 1, 1835.

“T. SARUM.”

“* At the commencement of every Parliament the Members are summoned to their legislative duty by the King's Writ, and are expressly convened to “defend the Church,” as well as “the State,” against “imminent perils.” If certain persons are now, by a very strange anomaly, admitted into Parliament, from whom “peril” to the Church is especially to be apprehended, they must feel themselves bound in conscience (if they consult their conscience) by the tenor of the King's Writ to “defend the Church” of England and Ireland; and by their own declaration to do nothing to its detriment or loss!!!”

Part of this letter appeared in our last volume (pp. 199, 200) ; but we have deemed it best to give it entire in this place.

For an account of the Bishop's labours in organizing the Royal Society of Literature, of which he was President for eight years, and of his literary labours, on the planting of Christianity in England (in all probability) by St. Paul, and in defence of the Deity of our Saviour against the modern Socinians, and of the disputed clause in 1 John v. 7, our readers must consult Mr. Harford's volume. Of the last-mentioned controversy he has given a perspicuous and concise account. There is, however, one little inaccuracy, into which he has been led, most probably by some of the good Bishop's memoranda, and which we are sure we shall have his thanks for correcting. In page 409, noticing some ancient MSS. of the Latin Vulgate, which are said to contain the disputed clause, Mr. Harford says : " Alcuin's MS. in the British Museum, which is of the eighth, or very early in the ninth century, also has it." We have examined the MS. here referred to, and *it has not the disputed clause*. The following is the reading of that MS. :—

Qum tres sunt qui testimoniū dant, sps aqua et sanguis, et hi
tres unū sunt. Si testimoniū hominū accipimus, testimoniū dñi
majus est.

The length which this article has reached, forbids us to cite any portion of the devout and edifying " *Sacra Privata* " of the venerable Bishop of Salisbury, or Mr. Harford's narrative of his last illness and death. They are deeply interesting, and cannot be perused without much spiritual benefit by the *Christian reader*. We will only add, in the words of the "sweet singer of Israel"—" Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright : for the end of that man is peace." Numerous tributes to the Bishop's memory, and to the value of his episcopal services by his successor in the Episcopate, and by other clergymen who intimately knew Dr. Burgess, enrich Mr. Harford's pages, which we hope will receive, what they so richly deserve, a wide circulation and an attentive perusal ; but we cannot withhold from our readers the following beautiful delineation of his character as a devout and humble Christian, from the pen of the Dean of Salisbury, in a sermon preached in the Cathedral, on the Sunday after his funeral :—

" His reliance on his Saviour's merits for pardon and acceptance in the sight of God was simple and sincere. Blameless and abundant as he was in every good work, he depended for salvation only on the atonement of Jesus Christ. This gave peace to his conscience, and enabled him to rejoice ' in hope of the glory of God.' He truly loved his Redeemer, and earnestly desired the extension of his kingdom.

He was a lover of good men, and delighted in their society. He was a father and friend to the poor. He was spiritually minded, 'which is life and peace.' How fervently he desired, and how diligently he pursued the perfection and the happiness of a higher world, those who conversed with him most confidentially and unreservedly best know. He aspired to the communion of prophets and apostles, of saints and angels, and, more than all, to a nearer and more intimate approach to 'God the Judge of all,' and to 'Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant.' The anticipation of this blessed and glorious termination of his earthly course cheered him amidst the infirmities of age, and the prospects of the grave. His faith triumphed over the last enemy; and he is, doubtless, now safe in 'the resting-place of the spirits of the just,' awaiting, in joyful hope, the adoption, that is, 'the redemption of the body,' in that day when, with the assembled Church of the redeemed, he shall arise radiant and immortal from the tomb." p. 527.

Two well-engraved portraits of Bishop Burgess adorn Mr. Harford's volume: one, a half-length, in his episcopal robes, which was executed many years since; the other, a whole length profile or black shade, sitting, just as we saw him two or three years before his decease. It is an admirable outline likeness, which will render the volume more valuable to such of its possessors as knew and revered this pious, learned, and amiable Prelate. We terminate our notice of Mr. Harford's labours with his own concluding sentences, which are not more true than they are elegantly expressed:—"IN WHATEVER LIGHT POSTERITY MAY REGARD HIS WRITINGS, THE NAME AND MEMORY OF BURGESS WILL NOT CEASE TO BE REVERED IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, AS A MODEL OF EPISCOPAL VIRTUE AND PRIMITIVE PIETY."

Ecclesiastical Report.

IN reviewing the Ecclesiastical proceedings of the last quarter, we shall confine ourselves to the most important. Every session produces some attack on our beloved Church and our most valuable institutions. Nor can we feel surprised that such should be the case, when we consider the materials of which the present Ministry is composed, or those of which the House of Commons is constituted. It is true that, owing to the pressure and influence of a very large Conservative minority in the Commons House of Parliament, little mischief has been produced to our Ecclesiastical institutions; but, at the same time a series of attacks has been directed against them, from which

the *animus* of the present Ministry and their supporters is clearly discerned. No efforts shall be wanting on our part to oppose the march of destructive principles.

We shall arrange the various subjects, not according to their relative importance, but as nearly as possible in the order in which they have occurred during the previous quarter.

THE CLERGY RESERVES.

The question respecting the lands, which come under the designation "The Clergy Reserves," is one of considerable importance, and one that has excited much interest in this country and in the Canadas. It has been debated in Parliament, and deserves the most serious consideration. A brief sketch of the proceedings connected with the subject will enable our readers to decide on the merits of the question. In the year 1791 an Act was passed, by which it was provided that no grant of land should be made to any party, but with the reservation of one-seventh portion of the same for the support of a *Protestant Clergy* in Upper Canada. The lands so reserved were the property of the Crown; and from that period they have been designated "The Clergy Reserves." It was also enacted that no measure affecting the religion of the colony should be permitted to pass into a law, by receiving the Royal assent, until it had lain, during thirty days, on the table of the two Houses of the Imperial Parliament, in order that the Houses might have an opportunity of addressing the Crown on the subject. By addressing the Crown against the measure it would be defeated, as in that case the Royal assent would be refused. On the other hand, should the Houses refrain from an address, they would give their tacit consent to the bill of the Colonial Legislature—the Royal assent would be granted, and the bill would become the law of the Colony.

A question arose, some years since, as to the meaning of the expressions in the bill of 1791—"A Protestant Clergy." It was submitted to the law-officers of the Crown in the year 1819, when the opinion then given was to this effect, namely, that the words might be construed to extend to the clergy of the Church of Scotland, as well as to the clergy of the Church of England, but not to the ministers of other denominations—in other words, that the terms were limited to those ministers who were recognised and established by the law of the land, and not to Dissenters. The law-officers thought, therefore, in 1819, that the Governor might make a provision for the clergy of the Church of Scotland from the profits derived from the Clergy Reserves.

Her Majesty's Government, however, acting on the latitudinarian principle, were not content with such an interpretation of the words, "A Protestant Clergy." The Governor-General of the Province, therefore, in obedience to his instructions from the Government at home, proposed a measure to the Colonial Legislature, which was carried in that assembly. The bill provides that the land called the "Clergy Reserves" should be sold, and that the proceeds should be divided among all the religious bodies in the colony—not merely amongst the clergy of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland and the ministers of all Dissenting bodies, but also among the clergy of the Church of Rome. By this bill, therefore, the Act of 1791 was completely set aside; and the question naturally arose, whether the Colonial Legislature had the power to repeal that Act?

It has already been stated that any measure from the Legislature of the Colony must be on the tables of both Houses during thirty days; at the expiration of which period, if no address be presented from the British Parliament, the Royal assent is given. After the bill had been laid on the tables of the two Houses, a very important discussion arose on the meaning of the words, "A Protestant Clergy." The Bishop of Exeter contended that they must be confined to the clergy of the Church of England: and we cannot avoid the conclusion that his Lordship's construction was the right one. If those words are taken alone, without any reference to the subsequent sections of the Act, they certainly might be construed to apply to the Church of Scotland: but looking at other clauses in the Act, there can be but one opinion as to the meaning put upon the words by its framers in 1791. We have no unfriendly feeling towards the Church of Scotland; on the contrary, we would contend most strenuously for its support: but we cannot shut our eyes to the simple fact, that the framers of the bill of 1791 referred only to the clergy of the Church of England. Certain clauses that follow set the matter at rest as to what is meant by "A Protestant Clergy." The clergy comprehended under that designation were, by the Act, to be subject to the canons of the Church of England and to her Bishops; and every one knows that no one, except a clergyman of the Church of England, is subject to those canons, or to those Bishops. Unless, therefore, the Scottish clergy are subject to the canons, they cannot be comprehended under the terms used in the Act. It is by a reference to other clauses that the words "Protestant Clergy" are to be interpreted.

It was the intention of the Archbishop of Canterbury to

move an address to the Crown before the expiration of the thirty days. Had such a motion passed, the bill from the Colonial Legislature would not have received the Royal assent. Such a course was, however, rendered unnecessary, because the Legislature of Upper Canada had exceeded their lawful powers. It was argued, and admitted in the House of Lords, that if the Colonial Legislature could not set aside the bill of 1791, it would not be necessary to discuss the question of an address to her Majesty.

Our readers are aware that the Bishop of Exeter proposed that certain questions respecting the Clergy Reserves should be submitted to the Judges for their opinion. On this occasion a discussion took place on the meaning or application of the words "Protestant Clergy." The Bishop of Exeter's opinion has already been stated. Lord Melbourne argued that the Legislature of 1791 intended to include the clergy of the Church of Scotland, and all the Dissenting ministers of the Colony; and he supported his position by this notable argument, namely, "If the Legislature of 1791 meant, by the words 'Protestant Clergy,' the clergy of the Church of England and the clergy of the Church of Scotland, why did they not say so?" This is a most extraordinary argument, certainly. The Legislature of that day did not say, in so many words, that they did not include Dissenters, because no one at that time ever dreamed of applying the term "Clergy" to Dissenting ministers. The Dissenters did not apply it themselves, for they looked upon the word as purely popish. It was not until these liberal days that the Dissenters have been dignified with such a title. But further, the Legislature of 1791 have, in effect, though not in words, declared that they only meant the Clergy of the Church of England: for they have decided that the Clergy in question were subject to the canons and Bishops of that Church. With the Act before him, it is most extraordinary that Lord Melbourne should assert that the Legislature of 1791 intended to include all denominations in the term, in order that the Government afterwards might make a general distribution. His Lordship, however, allowed, as indeed he was compelled to do, on his own principle of taking the words without considering them in connexion with subsequent clauses, that "Protestant Clergy" only were contemplated; and yet the bill of the Colonial Legislature, prepared by authority of the Government at home, embraces even the papists!

The Bishop of Exeter succeeded in his object. It was agreed by their Lordships, that certain questions should be

submitted to the Judges. On the 4th of May those learned individuals returned the following answers :—

“ To the first question we are all of opinion that the words, ‘A Protestant Clergy,’ in the 31st Geo. III. cap. 31, sections 35 to 42, are large enough to include, and do include, other clergy than clergy of the Church of England, and Protestant Bishops, and Priests, and Deacons, who have received Episcopal ordination. And to the second part of the question, ‘If any other, what other?’ we answer clergymen of the Church of Scotland. With respect to the second question, we are all of opinion that the 41st section of the 31st Geo. III. cap. 31, is entirely prospective, and that the power which it gave to the Legislative Council and Assembly of either of the provinces of Upper or Lower Canada, is limited to future allotments and appropriations, and cannot be intended to affect lands which have been already allotted and appropriated under former grants. With respect to the last question proposed, we all agree in opinion, that the Legislative Council and Assembly of Upper Canada have exceeded their lawful authority in passing an Act ‘to provide for the sale of the Clergy Reserves, and for the distribution of the proceeds thereof,’ in respect to both the enactments specified in your Lordships’ question; and that any sale that has been, or that may be made, under the second of those enactments, will be contrary to the provisions of the 7th and 8th Geo. IV., and therefore void.”

Now, it is argued by the ministerial supporters, that the Judges have decided that the words “Protestant Clergy” are large enough to include all Dissenting ministers in the Colony. We contend, however, that there is no evidence to shew that such was the opinion of the Judges. On the contrary, there is strong presumptive proof that they did not think so, since, had such been their views, they would certainly have expressed them; whereas, they merely say, that the words embraced more than the clergy of the Church of England, : and when asked what clergy, they replied the “clergy of the Church of Scotland.” We argue that the Judges, had they deemed the words capable of comprehending Dissenters, would have said so; or why did they specify the Scotch clergy? The question was plain and pointed: “If any other, what other?” Surely the Judges would not have contented themselves with such an answer as that which was given, if they had really intended to comprehend all Dissenters. It would be absurd even to suppose such a thing.

On this point, however, the opinion of the Judges was opposed to that of the Bishop of Exeter, who certainly did not include the clergy of the Scotch Church. And here we may notice the misrepresentations which were put forth with so much confidence respecting the statements of the

Bishop. It was said, that he had asserted that "there was no Church in Scotland:" that the Church of Scotland was no true church. This assertion was, to our own knowledge, most confidently made in numerous circles in London; and made, too, by persons who ought to have satisfied themselves of the truth by a perusal of his Lordship's speech. It suited the policy, however, of such persons to propagate the slander. At length the Bishop noticed the subject from his place in Parliament. The truth is, the Bishop of Exeter, in his speech, had spoken of the Church of Scotland in the most respectful terms—he had said that he wished it to be supported in the Colonies; but he did not think that the Clergy Reserves, which he viewed as exclusively set apart for the Church of England, should be devoted to that purpose. It will be seen, from the answer of the Judges, that the Colonial Legislature, in disposing of the Clergy Reserves, had exceeded their powers. The bill could not, therefore, receive the Royal assent, nor was it necessary to address the Crown on the subject.

It might have been supposed, after such an opinion, that the question would have been set at rest, and that no attempt would be made to divert the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves from the object for which they were intended, and for which they were originally given. Such, however, is not the case; for, on the 28th of May, Lord John Russell actually asked and obtained leave to bring in a bill exactly similar in its objects with that which had been forwarded from Canada. Lord John stated, that when the Colonial Bill was considered, a question arose whether it did not interfere with the Act of the 7th and 8th Geo. IV.: the Judges, as we have seen, decided that such was the case. In consequence of that decision, Lord John Russell applied for leave to bring in a bill on the subject. He stated that it was now necessary for the Imperial Legislature to interfere; the bill was not before the House, but his Lordship affirmed that it was nearly the same as the Colonial Bill. On this occasion he argued, that the Roman Catholics ought to be included in the disposition of the money, on the ground that they were numerous, and also that they were peaceable subjects in Canada. He proposes, therefore, that the lands shall be sold; that one quarter of the proceeds should be given to the Church of England, one quarter to the Church of Scotland, and the remainder to be distributed at the discretion of the Governor to all the religious parties in the colony, including the Roman Catholics. Of course, we know that an Act of the Imperial Parliament is omnipotent, but it may be unjust, for justice is not always an attendant on power; and most assuredly it must

be an act of injustice to take away from the Church of England what was intended for her support.

THE CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY.

At the April meeting Mr. Palmer gave notice of a motion, which, if carried, would have altered the constitution of this venerable and valuable society. The motion was brought forward at the meeting in May, when it was negatived by a majority of 27,—142 voting for the amendment, and 115 against it. In this changing age, we should be very sorry to see the constitution of this venerable society altered. The success of that motion would have been a reflection on the society, and on all the Bishops of our Church, for more than a century. We rejoice, therefore, that the attempt to alter its constitution was defeated.

CHURCH RATES.

The question of Church Rates continues to be fiercely agitated by the Dissenters, who are, of course, supported by the Papists and the Infidels. Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Burnett, Mr. Hume and others, can meet on common ground in resisting the laws of the land on this subject. The very fact of such a union is sufficient to open the eyes of reflecting and honourable men. Our readers are aware of the Braintree case, which has attracted so much attention. That case appears now be settled; and it seems to be decided, that the churchwardens are not able to levy a rate upon the parishioners without the concurrence of the vestry. We are not aware that in any other instance the attempt was ever made; but at Braintree the churchwardens, it would seem, did impose the rate, even in opposition to the vestry: it is now settled that they had not authority to do so. We cannot, in justice, complain of such a decision: but we repeat, that when the rate is legally imposed, the refusal to pay is as great a violation of the law of the land as the refusal to pay any other tax. Nor can the man who refuses to pay complain if his goods are distrained, any more than in the case of any other enforcement of the laws of the land. The Dissenter who purchases a farm, takes possession of the land with a full knowledge that it is subject to a certain payment; and had not the land been subjected to such payment, he must have purchased it at a higher rate. The sum, therefore, which he pays for church rates is *not his own*; and to refuse to pay it, is an unlawful retention of what does not of right belong to him. *Conscience* is pleaded by Dissenters in their refusal; but it is evident that conscience can have nothing to do with the question. We cannot think much of that man's

conscience who purchases or inherits property subject to a certain payment, and who, after obtaining possession, refuses to pay it.

John Thorogood still remains in prison ; but even his friends admit that he acted foolishly in not allowing the churchwardens to distrain his goods for the amount. It appears from a correspondence which has appeared in the *Sun* paper, that the sympathy which was once felt for him has abated, in consequence of the speech of Dr. Lushington. A gentleman, it seems, has offered to pay the costs, if he can be liberated ; and even Thorogood's friends do not appear to view him as a martyr. We apprehend that Thorogood was the victim of some of his dissenting friends, who persuaded him that it would be a grand thing to resist the payment of the rate, and abide by the consequences. They talk of the Church as the prosecutor of this individual : whereas the Church is not concerned in the business. Church rates are imposed by the laws of the land, and the Church has no power as a Church. Nor are the clergy at all implicated. The rate was levied by the proper officers, who were officers of the parish. Why did not Thorogood resist the payment of the assessed taxes ? he might have done so with more justice than in the present case. Church rates are of more ancient standing than the assessed taxes. We will suppose a case : A man purchased a house before the window tax was imposed ; at length a tax is levied, and he finds that he must pay several pounds per annum for his windows. Now, the very same house was purchased with a knowledge that it was subject to a Church rate of a certain amount ; can the individual, as an honest man, refuse to pay that which was implied in the very contract ? And not only did he pledge himself to pay when he made the purchase, but he knew that the rate was imposed by the laws of his country.

PROPRIETARY CHAPELS.

In London, and most of our large towns, there are certain unconsecrated chapels, in which the worship of the Church of England is performed, under the authority of the Bishop's licence. It appears to us that much misapprehension has existed, and does still exist, in the minds of many persons respecting these chapels. We intend, therefore, to submit a few remarks on the subject, which has been brought under our notice by the recent decision in the Consistory Court in the following case, "*The Office of the Judge promoted by Hodgson against Dillon.*"

These chapels are private property : they can be closed at the will of the proprietor, or they may be devoted to other

purposes. In extensive parishes they are necessary for the accommodation of the people; for, in many cases, the parish church does not provide seats for a tenth part of the population. Proprietary chapels, therefore, originated in necessity. When a parish or district contains an overwhelming population, the Bishop of the diocese and the incumbent are glad to open chapels of this description. If a sufficient number of churches were built in every parish, they would be unnecessary. It is requisite, in the first place, in order to the obtaining of a licence for such a chapel, to procure the consent of the incumbent. In short, the incumbent must nominate to the chapel, as in the case of an ordinary curate, for the law has not made any provision for such places. Without such nomination, the Bishop cannot grant his licence; since the incumbent is solely responsible for the spiritual concerns of the parish, and may consent or refuse to have a gentleman licensed in a chapel, as he thinks proper: nor can he be called upon to give a reason for his refusal. When once the incumbent has nominated a clergyman to a proprietary chapel, he has not the power to withdraw the licence; but, when a vacancy occurs, his nomination is again necessary, or he may close the chapel. The incumbent also has the sole power over the pulpit of such chapel—he can enter it when he pleases; and as he is responsible for the spiritual affairs of his parish, as well as for the doctrines preached, it would be strange indeed if he did not possess that power. Such is the authority of the rector in these cases.

If a clergyman, therefore, should be determined to proceed without authority, he would immediately become a Dissenter, and his chapel must be licensed as a dissenting meeting-house. Even in that case the Bishop probably has the power, by the canon law, to call him to account for his conduct in acting irregularly, and against the solemn vow made at his ordination. The man who ventures to persevere in such a course, without licence and authority, violates one of the most solemn engagements into which a frail mortal can enter. To us it is a most extraordinary thing, that any clergymen should be so forgetful of their sacred pledges as to act in opposition to the authority which they have engaged to obey. It seems, however, that such there are.

And now with respect to the power of the Bishop. The Bishop, as has been stated, cannot licence any one to any such chapel without the incumbent's permission. But when once the licence is granted, the Bishop possesses a power which the incumbent does not; he can withdraw the licence at his own discretion, just as in the case of any other curate, and without

assigning any reason for his conduct. The ministers of proprietary chapels, therefore, can be appointed only by the incumbent; they can be removed only by the Bishop. Such is the law of the case. In this sense it was clearly expounded by Dr. Lushington in the case already alluded to.

THE INSPECTION OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The National Society have determined to adopt a system of inspection. The inspectors will examine all the schools in those places in which their services may be required. From the instructions to inspectors, issued by the society, it is clear that the committee in London have proceeded with the utmost caution and delicacy. They remind the inspectors, that their object is merely to assist the clergy and others in the management of their schools. Due notice is to be given when an inspector is about to visit any particular school, to the clergyman of the parish and the managers, and he is to confer with these parties on the subject.

As the society has recently adopted new terms of union, there will not be a parochial school which is not in connexion with the National Society. Objections may have existed formerly, in the minds of some clergymen, on the ground that they could not choose their own books. We never considered the restricted catalogue of books to be an evil; but we admit the necessity of consulting the scruples of others. On this account we rejoice in the relaxation of the rule: and the result will, we are convinced, be a large increase of schools in union with the National Society. No one, indeed, will now have any reasonable ground for objection.

Five of her Majesty's Judges have consented to act as inspectors of schools in union with the London Diocesan Board, in company with certain clergymen nominated by the Bishop as their coadjutors. Of course the Judges have consented to act only until a permanent arrangement is made. It is, however, a most praiseworthy act on the part of these learned personages.

SOCIETIES.

Our readers are acquainted with the merits of the various societies which are conducted by members of the Anglican Church, and whose object it is to promote her interests. Since our last number most of these societies have held their annual meetings: and it is most gratifying to learn that the funds of a large portion of them are in a prosperous state. While the National School Society superintends the education of our home population, there are other institutions, whose

operations are directed to our Colonial possessions, and, indeed, to every quarter of the globe. It is not our intention, nor indeed have we space, to specify the various societies supported by members of our Church, nor to discuss their merits: we merely allude to the question for the purpose of informing our readers, that the proceedings of the past year afford ample evidence of the zeal, activity, and piety of churchmen.

SOCIALISM.

Socialism has received a check, from which, we trust, it will never recover; and this check is owing to the well-directed efforts of the Bishop of Exeter. In consequence of his exertions, the Marquis of Normanby issued his circular, which has most assuredly been of the utmost service in putting down an evil daily becoming more and more portentous. The leaders and agents of the body are now under the necessity of carrying on their operations with great secrecy. In many districts the magistrates are extremely active in enforcing the laws; so that it is to be expected, that many of those who had imbibed the wicked and degrading principles of the party, will be delivered from the danger with which they were threatened.

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, AND PROPOSALS FOR ALTERING THE LITURGY.

"There is no new thing," says the wisest of men, "under the sun." Now the proposal to alter the Liturgy, and to give up Subscription to Articles of Faith is not a new thing, and before we conclude our remarks, we shall submit a few historical notices to our readers on this particular point. But though there have ever been clergymen in the Church of England who have complained of the Liturgy, and censured the Thirty-nine Articles, yet they have always been a very small party: and we are happy to find that the party is not increased in number. There are *radicals* in Church matters as well as in politics. It would be strange indeed if the Church of England had no unworthy sons. Most of her clergy are consistent and obedient children: and, if the reins of discipline were drawn somewhat tighter, a most salutary effect would be produced, even on those who are inclined to be refractory.

It is truly surprising that such a question should be revived, by men calling themselves churchmen, and eating the bread of the Church, as that expressed in the petition presented on the 26th of May to the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Dublin. It appears that it was signed by *sixty* persons, of whom thirty were laymen. Now, as the laity are not concerned

in the matter of subscription at all, and in the Liturgy no further than in hearing it read, we cannot conceive what reason they have to interfere in the business. If it be said that they are offended with expressions or sentiments in the latter, we reply, that they could not attend any dissenting meeting-house without hearing something to offend them in the *extempore* prayer of the minister. If, moreover, these thirty laymen were permitted to make alterations to suit their own taste, the very changes might be offensive to others among the laity, to say nothing whatever of the clergy.

The petitioners pray to be relieved in the matter of subscription, and they ask for certain alterations in the Liturgy. The Archbishop of Dublin told the petitioners that he had one strong objection to their course, namely, that Parliament could not interfere in such matters, but only with the temporal affairs of the Church. It was also admitted by the Most Reverend Prelate, that it was a very anomalous state of things for the Church to be without a legislative government. Such, however, is the case. She has an executive government in her Bishops and her Ecclesiastical Courts: but, since the Convocation ceased to act above a century ago, she has not had a legislative government.

It was asserted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and by the Bishops of London and Lincoln, that any proposal to alter the Liturgy or relinquish the subscription to the Articles, would be deprecated by the great body of the clergy. We can testify that all our own clerical friends concur in that sentiment. The Bishop of Lincoln admitted, that when any considerable body of the clergy united to demand alterations, the Convocation, in his opinion, should be assembled for the purpose of duly considering the subject, since to that body all such matters must be submitted. In the petition there was a request that the Lords would make the letter of the Prayer Book and Subscription to the Articles more consistent with the practice of the clergy, and the acknowledged meaning of the Church. This would be most assuredly an inversion of the natural order of things; and, therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury most pertinently remarked, that it was an imputation on the clergy, and that if it were a bill instead of a petition, he would move an amendment, praying their Lordships to make the practice of the clergy more consistent with the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles.

On the presentation of the petition, on the 26th of May, a most extraordinary course was pursued by one member of the Episcopal Bench. We allude to the Bishop of Norwich, who

broached sentiments in unison with those of the petitioners. But it is consolatory to know, that few, if any, of his Episcopal brethren concur with his Lordship in the opinion which he thus expressed. We cannot refrain from quoting the closing portion of the well-merited castigation inflicted on his Lordship by the Bishop of London :

“ If the Articles were not scriptural, if they were calculated to do more mischief than good, let them be abandoned : but do not interfere with the terms of subscription : do not, for the sake of the tender consciences and nice scruples of some, adopt a mode of subscription which would leave the door open to the most unscrupulous. He confessed he did not see anything of the hardship that was complained of in this matter. Prior to ordination, was not every man so conversant with what he was required to do, that when he came to it, he ought to do so with a clear conscience or not do it at all ? That he thought was a complete answer to the application for an expansion of the terms of subscription. As he had already stated, he believed that the great body of the Church was indisposed to any alteration of the formularies of the Church. If an alteration were to be made for one tender conscience, an alteration ought to be made for another tender conscience. Where, then, was the system of perpetual change to be stayed ? If their Lordships were to set out upon the principle of satisfying all, they would soon have no peculiarity of doctrine, no Articles, no Liturgy, but would reduce the Church to a mere *caput mortuum*, neither satisfying the consciences of men here, nor offering a sound foundation on which to base their hopes of hereafter. Therefore he strongly deprecated their Lordships’ tampering in any degree with matters of this kind. At the same time he was fully prepared to admit, that it was extremely desirable that there should be some deliberative, if not legislative assembly in the Church, by whom such questions as the present might be determined.”

Our readers are aware that similar attempts have been made on previous occasions. In the year 1750 was published a work bearing the following title : “ Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church ;” in which every part of the Liturgy is canvassed. Certain changes are proposed ; which, had they been adopted, would have opened the door to any Arian or Socinian in the world. At that time, as at present, the cavillers and objectors were few in number, and the matter fell to the ground. The subject was afterwards revived by Archdeacon Blackburne, a man who, though he partook of the bread of the Church, spent his life in endeavouring to undermine her foundation. The “ Confessional” is a well-known work. Blackburne was its author, as is known to all those who are conversant with the subject. The Archdeacon tells us, that the question of a Review of the Liturgy was discussed, not only in pamphlets, but in private parties, “ *when cards were not in the way.*” In

one of those parties the author of the "Confessional" introduced the subject of Subscription to the Articles. One of the party expressed a wish to see the case stated upon paper. The result was the publication of that work. It appears that an Association was formed, called "The Feathers' Tavern Association," for the purpose of obtaining relief from Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. In 1772 a petition was presented to Parliament in favour of the object; but it was rejected by a large majority. Every attempt hitherto made has been a signal failure; and we are convinced that, at the present moment, the feeling among the clergy against any alteration in the Liturgy, or any relaxation of the terms of subscription, is stronger than at any previous period of our history.

The petitioners must have an extraordinary notion of Church matters in general. Neither the House of Lords nor the House of Commons, nor both conjointly, could effect any alteration in the Liturgy. It is not their province. The Convocation is the only assembly in which such things can be discussed. If it were decided that the Liturgy should be revised, the regular course would be the appointment of a Commission by the Crown to deliberate on the changes proposed to be effected. The proceedings of the Commission would then be submitted to the Convocation, where each point would be discussed with the greatest attention. Should any changes be made by that assembly, the Crown would add its sanction, and then the alteration would be binding on the Church.

With regard to the Articles, it is said by latitudinarian churchmen, why should subscription be imposed? Why should it not be sufficient to declare a belief in the sacred volume? This objection is grounded on the fact, that men differ in opinion on certain doctrines stated in the Thirty-nine Articles. It may, however, be observed, in reply to this objection, that the same argument, if argument it may be called, would apply with equal force to the Bible itself: for men differ respecting that sacred book. Nay, all parties, diametrically opposed as they may be to one another, profess to derive their doctrines from the Bible; so that the argument respecting differences of opinion will apply to the Word of God as well as to the Thirty-nine Articles. The consequence is obvious, namely, that on such a principle the Bible itself must be disallowed, and all men must be left at liberty to follow their own inclinations.

It seems that certain Dissenting journals have taken up the late petition. The writers in those journals exult in the superiority of the Dissenting system over that of the Anglican Church. They assert that there is no subscription among

Dissenters. Now we ask, in the first place, what, in the name of common-sense, have Dissenters to do with the question? Would they, if subscription were abolished, and the Liturgy were altered, join the communion of the Anglican Church? Are they so dissatisfied with their own system as to wish, when an opportunity offers, to relinquish it for another? They are left in the enjoyment of their own liberty. It is secured to them by the Act of Toleration; nor does any one wish to deprive them of it. We entertain no hostile feeling towards them: and why should they not suffer us to be at peace without any interference on their part? They are not called upon to subscribe; nor are they compelled to come to our churches. They may erect as many meeting-houses as they please, and preach or believe what doctrines they like. As far as regards the interference of churchmen, every Dissenter may do what is right in his own eyes. They have, therefore, no concern in the matter at all. But when they boast of being freed from subscription, they boast of liberty which they do *not* enjoy. It is true they are not compelled, by the laws of the land, to subscribe to any Confession of Faith; but is it not a fact that they impose a subscription on themselves? In the Church of England the clergy alone are concerned in the matter of subscription, the laity being freed from anything of the kind; but all who wish to become members of Dissenting bodies are obliged to subscribe to certain doctrines or be refused admission. Every one must state his opinions, and those opinions must be exactly in accordance with the views of the body, or he is rejected. This is subscription with a vengeance. It is a much greater infringement on Christian liberty than subscription to articles. When, therefore, Dissenters boast of their freedom, the boast is vain; for they are in trammels to a system, in comparison of which the Church of England is perfect liberty. Many, indeed, who write as Dissenters, belong to no body of professing Christians; and being satisfied with dissenting from the Established Church, have yet their religion to choose. The Infidel, for instance, is a Dissenter, and such Dissenters may boast of their freedom; but the members of regular dissenting bodies are tied and bound with chains much heavier than any which the Church of England imposes upon her clergy.

We may remark, however, that the Dissenters have suffered materially from the want of a written Confession of Faith, which should continue the same at all times. Their mode is exceedingly rigid, for no one is received into any dissenting party, unless he believes with the party; but having no written Confession, it is always in the power of the majority to adopt new

opinions: so that they have no security against change. The chapels built by the old Non-conformists are, in consequence of the absence of a written Confession, all gone over to Socinianism, the congregations having, in process of time, entirely changed their views on the essential doctrines of the Gospel. And in the congregations now in existence a change is continually going on. To day a particular congregation may be Baptists—to morrow, Independents; and, in a short space, Socinians. This evil is inherent in the very system; it is one against which they have no means of guarding, except by the adoption of a written Confession, or, in other words, Articles of Faith, which they profess to reprobate. One exception must be made with regard to the sect called "Lady Huntingdon's Connexion," who have fifteen doctrinal articles drawn up by that lady, and which all the ministers of that body have to sign.

In proof of our position we appeal to the history of Dissenters, and to the history of the Churches of England and Scotland. Let almost any one of the older chapels of the Dissenters be selected, and its history will be a mere detail of changes of views—one preacher proclaiming one thing, and another the opposite; the congregation at one period professing to adopt opinions which were repudiated, within a short space, by their successors in the same edifice. Nor can it be otherwise with Dissent, since it is based on a principle which must issue in constant change. But, on the other hand, let us turn to the Church and the Kirk. The former has Articles of Faith and a prescribed Liturgy; the latter, though her Liturgy is no longer in use, has a Confession of Faith, to which every minister must subscribe. And what is the consequence? We find that the faith of both is just what it was at the Reformation: all the great doctrines are retained in their purity. We cannot conceive that any argument can be adduced more conclusive.

During the reigns of Charles II. and James II., the Non-conformists generally retained the doctrines which they held at the period of the Restoration. In the next reign the Act of Toleration was passed, by which the Dissenters were enabled to worship after their own system; but it was provided, that all their ministers should subscribe to the doctrinal Articles of the Anglican Church. At that time the ministers willingly submitted to this test. They believed the doctrines of the Articles, and had no scruples relative to subscription: for their objections had existed only against those articles which related to Church discipline, rites, and ceremonies. As long as that race of ministers survived, no complaints were uttered on the

hardship of subscription. At length, however, other men arose, who were not content to walk in the steps of their predecessors. They began to clamour against the subscription; it was a yoke to which they could not submit; it was an infringement of Christian liberty. Such were the clamours which were constantly raised by numbers of the dissenting body. After some years, therefore, the subscription was relinquished. Now, let the consequences be particularly marked: from that time many of the ministers went over to Socinianism. The check was removed, and Socinianism entered in: so that orthodox Dissent received its greatest blow, in the rejection of the subscription to the doctrinal Articles of the Anglican Church.

One most prominent objection to the Liturgy is the insertion of the Athanasian Creed. How, say the objectors, can we assent to the damnatory clauses? We again appeal to the Bible. We reply that, on this ground, the Bible itself must be rejected; since the clauses alluded to are nothing more than certain passages of Holy Writ inserted in the Creed, and repeated by the minister and congregation. According to the line of argument adopted by such objectors, no man could subscribe to our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned." Is there a doctrine in the Creed which is not in the Bible? It is to the doctrines that the subscription relates: and when it said, that "whosoever will be saved must thus think of the Trinity"—it is the great doctrine itself, and not any particular expression in the Creed, which is intended. Of course a man who denies the Trinity cannot subscribe to the clauses in question, since by so doing he would pass a sentence of condemnation on himself; but, as all persons who belong to the Anglican Church must of necessity receive that doctrine, we cannot conceive how any such objection can be raised. Socinians and Arians are not called upon to subscribe, and therefore have no reason to complain of the retention of the Creed in our Service. We do not interfere with them in the rejection of the doctrine, nor can they justly complain of us in holding it. All such persons are excluded even from giving an opinion on the subject, because they are not in any way concerned. Who then are the parties aggrieved? They are certain members of our own Church; but, if those persons believe the doctrines of the Thirty-nine Articles, if they receive the Liturgy, they must also believe the doctrine of the Trinity; and, believing that doctrine, they cannot, with reason, complain of the Athanasian Creed, which merely asserts the doctrine in the language of sacred Scripture.

It is with feelings of disappointment that we find Mr. M'Neile unintentionally, as we believe, giving his support to the position that some changes are necessary in our Liturgy. He would not relinquish the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles: nor would he make any material alterations in the Services. His suggestions merely go to the extent of leaving the use of certain clauses and expressions to the option of the officiating minister. We fear, however, that such a measure would be followed with the most dangerous results. In the *first* place, has he considered the insuperable difficulties which stand in the way? Such matters, as we have already stated, could only be settled in Convocation. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that the Convocation would be agreed respecting the passages to be enclosed within brackets? Would not one man propose one clause, and another another clause? Such must be the case as long as the minds of men differ. We would remind Mr. M'Neile, that the passages which he would select, would not be selected by others: while those which he would by no means place in brackets, would, by others, be selected for that purpose. Hence, it would not be possible to decide on the clauses and expressions to be bracketed: or, if the plan were acted on at all, it must be pursued to such an extent, that every passage in the Liturgy would be placed within the proposed marks. The plan would be, most impolitic, since it would open the door to continual changes; but it is altogether impracticable, for no two individuals would be found to agree respecting the clauses and expressions to be placed within the brackets.

But we object on another ground: it would be destructive of that uniformity which has ever prevailed in the Church. We should find the bracketed passages omitted in one Church, and read in another; or perhaps read by one man in the morning, and omitted by another man in the evening in the same Church. Is such a state of things desirable? We have gone on for centuries on our present plan, and *why* should we now be called upon to submit to such changes?

Other very serious objections may be urged against such a proposal. Let the case of a rector and a curate be supposed—a case which Mr. M'Neile must admit would often occur, if such a measure as he proposes were carried. The rector wishes to omit the bracketed passages; the curate cannot conscientiously do so. Who does not see that endless disputes would be the consequence? As the matter now stands, such disputes are out of the question; since all the clergy in reading the Services are bound by the rubrics. The clergy would also be subjected to inconveniences of another kind, and even to insults. Some

parishioner would be anxious to induce his minister to omit certain passages from the daily service ; while others would recommend the omission of other parts. How could the clergyman act in such cases ? To say that the clergy would enjoy more liberty than they now possess is absurd, for they would then be subject to the interference and remonstrances of every parishioner, who might think himself wiser than his neighbours. Every reflecting person, we are convinced, would prefer the present system to such a state of things as would necessarily result from the adoption of Mr. M'Neile's suggestions.

Our Articles and Liturgy are so many fences against the introduction of unsound doctrines, and the adoption of irregular and unseemly practices according to the caprices of men. Every judicious man feels thankful that, in conducting the services of our Church, he is not left to his own discretion, or to the dictation of the people.

In some churches and chapels it is customary to observe the festivals appointed by the Church. We hope that the practice will soon be universal. On some of these occasions the expedient of a sermon is resorted to for the purpose, as is alleged, of inducing the people to attend the service. Now, we would not utter a word against preaching—we know, indeed, that it is the grand instrument in the conversion of sinners from the error of their ways—but we are convinced that, in the present day, the sermon is deemed the main thing for which the people assemble in God's house. On saints' days, therefore, it appears to us to be very desirable that no sermon should be preached. The people should be exhorted to come to church for the purpose of worship, to pray and to offer up their praises to Almighty God. Were there no sermon it would be seen that the congregation assembled for the sake of the service ; and any clergyman who has gained the affections of his people would easily succeed in convincing them that it was just as much their duty to come to church to join in the Liturgy as to hear a sermon ; we say this advisedly, and without regarding the charge of popery. Were festival days observed, together with the prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays, the people would have opportunities of evincing their attachment to our admirable Liturgy.

THE EPISCOPAL CLERGY OF SCOTLAND AND AMERICA.

A most important Bill has been laid on the table of the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which, if carried into a law, will remove those impediments by which clergymen from the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and

America are prevented from entering our pulpits. The state of the question is not generally understood ; we shall, therefore, explain it to our readers.

In order to officiate in our churches, a clergyman must not only be Episcopally ordained, but he must be ordained by a Bishop of the Church of England. As the law at present stands, merely canonical orders are not sufficient to qualify an individual for performing Divine Service in our Church. The Church regards as canonical all ordinations performed by Canonical Bishops. The Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and those of the Episcopal Church in the United States, are true Canonical Bishops ; and the ordinations performed by them are also canonical, for they derived their orders from our own Church. But, yet, neither the Bishops, nor the clergy ordained by them, can perform any spiritual act in England in consequence of certain Acts of Parliament, which restrain the exercise of the Episcopal and clerical office to those who are consecrated and ordained by our own Prelates.

From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen that the exclusion of the Scottish and American Episcopal Clergy is not the act of the *Church* of England, but of the *State* of England. The Church recognizes all who are canonically ordained, and in that light she views the ministers alluded to : but the State interposes, and requires, in order to the exercise of the ministry in England, that they should be *legally* ordained—that is, ordained by the English Bishops in this country or the British Colonies. By the canons of the Church, therefore, the clergy in question might officiate in England : but by the laws of the land they are restrained.

This is a very anomalous state of things ; and the Bill of the Archbishop is intended to remedy the evil. It will merely require proof of their canonical ordinations, and certain testimonials as to character ; and our own Bishops will be authorized to admit them to perform Divine Service in our churches.

It is singular that the evil should not have been rectified long since. No reason, whatever, existed for continuing the restrictions. In future, therefore, whenever a distinguished American clergyman visits this country, the Bishop of London will be able to permit him to preach in our Metropolitan Churches, as a canonically ordained minister : and other Bishops will be at liberty to pursue the same course in their respective dioceses. We, therefore, concur most cordially in the measure proposed by the Archbishop ; and we rejoice in the prospect of seeing this singular anomaly removed. Bishop Chase, Bishop Hobart, and several other American Bishops have been in England ;

they have associated much with our clergy, yet none of them could enter our reading-desks or our pulpits. Such a state of things will no longer be permitted to exist. The change will, we are convinced, be productive of great good, to our own as well as to the Episcopal Churches in Scotland and America. It will be seen that the three Churches are one and the same. To the Archbishop of Canterbury the clergy of all the three will feel deeply indebted, for being the instrument in the removal of those useless restrictions, which have so long operated to the exclusion of so many excellent men from our churches.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

This question is soon to be discussed in the House of Commons. Numerous petitions have already been placed on the table of the House, and we trust that many others will be forwarded to the same quarter. The whole subject will be submitted to Parliament this Session. Nay, it is now, probably under discussion, while this sheet is going through the press. Sooner or later we hope the House of Commons will be *compelled* to make a grant of public money for the purpose.

The motion of Sir Robert H. Inglis is a very extensive one, embracing topics of vast importance and magnitude. It will direct the attention of the House to the increased and rapidly increasing population of the country, and to the deficiency as to the number of churches for the accommodation of that population. It appears that the increase in the population in England and Wales has been *six millions* since the commencement of the present century. Certain grants have been made by Parliament for building additional churches, but not in proportion to the advance in the tide of population. Dissent, with its boasted voluntary principle, does *nothing* with the overwhelming masses of the people; it can only collect a few persons together here and there. The field of action is as wide as any Dissenter could wish; yet, what have they done? or, what can voluntarism do for the vast numbers who are perishing for lack of knowledge? The evil must be met by legislation, for voluntarism has proved itself to be insufficient.

Of course, the Radicals, Papists, and latitudinarians in the House of Commons, will oppose any resolution for a grant of public money for such a purpose. Some may, perhaps, take the ground that it is not just to supply the means of building churches, while the Dissenters are left to build their own chapels; and others will take the general ground, that it is not possible now to add to the burdens of the country. With

regard to the objectors of the former class, we have a very simple reply to make—that Dissenters, having adopted the voluntary principle, could not, even if it were offered, receive money from the State. And to the objectors of the second class we remark, that the money is demanded for the poor—for those who have no means of providing for their spiritual interests—for those who cannot attend the house of God, even if they would. Surely no Radical, professing as all radicals do, that he is the friend of the poor, can, consistently, refuse his consent to a grant of public money for the use, the sole use, of those very parties in whose welfare he professes to be so deeply interested.

However, after all the Radical and Papist opponents are deducted, we trust that there will be a very large body of men in the House of Commons who will stand forth as the advocates of a grant of public money for this most important object. Even her Majesty's Ministers if they consult, not merely the welfare of the people, but their own interests, will pause before they refuse. Should the object be defeated this Session, we hope that the people will speak to the Legislature through that medium which is always open to them—namely, BY PETITIONS—in a voice that cannot be mistaken.

General Literature.

A History of England, upon Christian Principles. By the Rev. J. WALTER. London: Rivington. 1839.

HOWEL, in one of his interesting familiar letters, says, very happily, that in perusing a well-written history, we seem to look upon past events with *ancestral eyes*. The expression is full of poetry; but its fancy is greater than its truth. The converse of the proposition ought to be true. Instead of gazing upon the epochs of history with ancestral eyes, we should examine them with the eyes of strangers; our minds should be uninfluenced by prejudice or by affection; our imaginations unkindled by the pageants, or inflamed by the wickedness, of a century; we should sit down to the study of history with feelings *unpromised*, so to speak, to any candidate for fame. If such be the duties of a reader, those of a writer are infinitely weightier and more important. Bolingbroke has given an outline of what he is to perform; and in cases of criticism, at least, we may, without hesitation, submit to be instructed by an enemy. "To teach and to inculcate," he says, "the principles of virtue, and the rules of

wisdom and good policy, resulting from those details, should form a prominent part in every historical design; a writer should put a thread into our hand, by which we may find our way in safety through the labyrinth of human folly and passion." But it has unfortunately happened that in this, as in other paths of knowledge, our guides are often ignorant, and often unfaithful. Political aggrandizement, party spirit, literary distinction, have been the chief sources of inspiration to the pen of the historian. History has been composed, as if it were the record of a *mortal*, instead of an *immortal*; as if the virtue, or the sin of any action, died with its author. It was to remedy this omission that Mr. Walter undertook the elaborate labour which is now before us. To write a History of England *upon Christian principles*, was, indeed, an exploit of which any author might justly be proud. It would be a manual against the allurements of ambition. But Mr. Walter has certainly not succeeded in producing such a work. His volumes are not *analytical*. We want a more searching anatomy of motives; a severer scrutiny into character; a clearer application of the Gospel-standard of measurement. Mr. Walter seems to have thought that he was writing a history upon Christian principles, when he illustrated his pages with Christian quotations; we think him very much in error. But the subject demands a larger space than we are able to afford it. It is not, however, improbable that we may return to it, at a future period, in attempting to present a general view of English historians. In the mean time, we can have no hesitation in recommending Mr. Walter's volumes, *as far as they go*; they evidently proceed from the pen of a scholar and a Christian, whose partial failure has arisen, as we believe, from an erroneous conception of the plan he was going to fill up.

1. *The History of France*, from the earliest periods to the present time, adapted for Youth, Schools, and Families. By Miss JULIA CORNER. London: Dean and Munday. 1840.
2. *The History of Spain and Portugal*, from the earliest periods to the present time, adapted for Youth, Schools, and Families. By Miss JULIA CORNER. London: Dean and Munday. 1840.

THESE little histories are unquestionably well intended, and they have the merit of cheapness and a pleasing style; but we are sorry to see so much liberalism peeping out here and there. Surely there was no necessity for Miss Corner, in teaching little girls the History of Spain, that she should become the apologist of the Jesuits. The History of France is freer from such faults.

Help to the Reading of the Bible. By BENJAMIN ELLIOTT NICHOLLS, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Walthamstow. New edition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

THIS little work fills up an important chasm in the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; it lays no claim, indeed, to originality, being for the most part composed of hints selected from the works of others. The author has arranged his materials in a lucid order, and has, we think, succeeded in the object which he purposed to undertake in the present compilation, viz., "to give such a view of the sacred volume, as may, through the divine blessing, awaken a desire to 'search the Scriptures,' and assist those who are making a first effort to do so." The following is the method pursued by Mr. Nicholls:—Part I., in four chapters, treats on the Divine authority of the Bible; on the purpose for which the Bible was given; on the manner in which the great truths of the Bible have been revealed; and on the interpretation of the Bible. Part II., in three chapters, discusses the government and public worship of the Jews, including some notices of Jewish sects. And Part III. contains a short account of the several books of the Bible, in eight chapters. Three neatly engraved maps accompany this volume, which we hope will find its way into every parochial and lending library. A copy of it would form an appropriate companion to the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, which are ordinarily given to the children of our charity schools on their going into service.

Dodd's Church History of England. From the commencement of the sixteenth century, to the Revolution in 1688, with notes, additions, and a continuation. By the Rev. M. A. TIERNEY, F.S.A. Vol. III. London: Dolman. 1840.

OUR opinion of this celebrated work is on record; the notes, additions, and continuation shall receive a notice in a separate article devoted to them, when the work is complete. It is handsomely printed and learnedly edited.

Roman Misquotation; or certain passages from the Fathers, adduced in a work entitled "the Faith of Catholics," brought to the test of the originals, and their perverted character demonstrated. By the Rev. RICHARD T. P. POPE, A.M. London: Holdsworth. 1840.

A more complete exposé of the abominable dishonesty too often practised by Romish controversialists, we would not desire to see than this. Mr. Pope has performed his task well, and has merited the thanks of all true members of the Anglican Church by the publication of this very well-timed and necessary work.

A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English; compiled from the most approved sources, Oriental and European, Jewish and Christian; containing all the words, with their usual inflexions, idiomatic usages, &c., as found in the Hebrew and Chaldee Texts of the Old Testament; and, for the convenience of the learner, arranged in the order of the Hebrew Alphabet; many hitherto obscure terms, phrases, and passages explained; and many errors of former Grammarians pointed out and corrected. To which are added three appendixes: The first containing a plan, with two sections, and a short description, of the Temple of Ezekiel, its courts, furniture, &c. The second, an English Index, alphabetically arranged, forming a reversed Dictionary, English, Hebrew, and Chaldee. The third presenting certain additions, corrections, &c., to the Lexicon generally, &c. By SAMUEL LEE, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. London: Duncan and Malcolm. 1840.

WE have much pleasure in announcing the publication of Professor Lee's Hebrew and English Lexicon, the execution of which will not detract from his long-established reputation. The title page above given, so fully expresses the object of the learned author (who makes grateful acknowledgment to the Rev. Arabic Professor Jarrett for much valuable aid), that we have only to add that the object proposed by Dr. Lee in undertaking this work has been fully attained. Conciseness and precision, the two grand requisites in all elementary works, have been particularly kept in view: and students of the Hebrew Scriptures (those especially who use Professor Lee's Hebrew Grammar), will find this Lexicon a most valuable auxiliary to their Biblical researches.

-
1. *The Standard of Catholicity*; or An Attempt to point out, in a plain manner, certain safe and leading principles, amidst the conflicting opinions by which the Church is at present agitated. By the Rev. G. E. BIBER, L.L.D. London: Parker. 1840.
 2. *Sermons on the Sacraments*. By HENRY BULLINGER, Minister of the Church at Zurich. Cambridge: Stevenson. 1840.

WE notice these works here, only to say that in our next number we shall examine them, and several others on "Catholicity" and "Sacraments," at considerable length. We cordially recommend, in the meantime, the beautiful reprint of Bullinger published by Mr. Stevenson.

Lectures on Locke; or the Principles of Logic, designed for the use of Students in the University. London: Cadell, Strand.

OF what University?—we suppose Oxford, though the lecturer does not inform us; the lectures are very well arranged, and have, for the most part, given us satisfaction.

L'Eglise Romaine comparée avec la Bible, les Pères de l'Eglise et l'Eglise Anglicane, en Six Sermons, prêchés par l'Evêque LUSCOMBE.
Paris, 1839. Londres : Bossange & Co.

THOSE of our readers, who wish to revive their knowledge of the French language may peruse this volume with equal pleasure and profit. The substance of it, Dr. Luscombe ingenuously states in his preface, is derived from the works of Bishops Taylor, Tomline, and Marsh. The six sermons, of which it consists, are a truly valuable compendium of Christian doctrine and Protestant truth. They were delivered in the English church at Paris, during Lent, in the year 1839 : and the Bishop has published them with the sole design of instructing those members of the Romish Church in France, who have not the opportunity of consulting the writings of the above-named Prelates. The following are the subjects discussed. 1. The pretended supremacy and infallibility of the Popes of Rome ; the sufficiency of Scripture ; tradition, transubstantiation, purgatory, pardon and indulgences, veneration of images, confession, communion in one kind, the prohibition of the Scriptures, the performance of Divine service in an unknown tongue, and the validity of the ordination of the Anglican Church. In an Appendix, besides a French version of our Thirty-nine Articles, Dr. Luscombe has adduced numerous passages from the Fathers, and other eminent writers of the Universal Christian Church. These quotations clearly demonstrate the following points, viz. : 1. That the Apostles regarded each other as equal in point of dignity and power ; 2. That Peter was *not* the foundation-stone intended by Christ, but Jesus Christ himself ; 3. That the Holy Scriptures ought to be read by every one, and translated into every living language, and not buried in dead languages ; 4. That the Holy Scriptures ought to be the *only* rule of faith, and not the unauthorized modern tradition of the Romish Church ; 5. That the doctrine of transubstantiation is not founded on Scripture : and that when Jesus Christ said, " This is my body," the natural and evident sense of these words was, and is, " This is the figure of my body ;" 6. 7. That the doctrines of purgatory and of absolution are equally anti-scriptural ; 8. That the worship of images is pure idolatry ; and 9. That the marriage of priests is lawful. In France, where the Popish clergy are assiduously endeavouring to assail the pure faith of the Gospel, held by all the Reformed Churches, such a publication as this must be peculiarly well-timed ; while the pious and gentle spirit with which it is written cannot but conciliate every candid and ingenuous Romanist.

Groans of the Grocers—Moans of the Slaves ; or, An Address to the Society for the Civilisation of Africa. By an Officer of the Navy. London : Richardson. 1840.

UNDER this very ill-chosen title we find a highly-important pamphlet. The object is a good one, and we wish it all success. The slave trade is abolished, and slavery has ceased in the British possessions ; but the produce of our West India possessions is daily *decreasing*, while that of the *slave-cultivated* colonies is proportionably *increasing*. Something must be done if our Colonies are to be preserved. Now the grocers, and some others, are about to present a petition to Parliament to admit other—that is, slave labour sugar ; and the consequence would, of course, be the utter ruin of our West India Colonies. The “Naval Officer” shows, clearly enough, that, were emigration encouraged, there would be so great an influx of hill-coolies or labourers from India into British Guiana and our other Western possessions, that their plantations would be soon again in full operation, and the planters contented. We want, say they to our Government, no slaves : if you will permit East Indian labourers to come, we will pay them well and treat them well ; they are to be freemen, not apprentices, and we will undertake the expense of their emigration ; *then* you will put a check upon slavery, for *then* we shall be able to compete with Cuba and other slave colonies. No ! say the Government : we will try first at Mauritius, and *then*, if the experiment succeeds *there*, you shall have permission to bring over coolies from India. In the meantime, for no *short* space can suffice to satisfy our Government as to this experiment, our Western Colonies are going downwards—lands out of cultivation, and planters out of spirits. There ought to be *no* objection—ought to have been none long ago : and then that abominable blot upon human nature, the slave trade, would have been decreasing instead of *increasing*, as, alas ! it is. We shall recur to this subject again ; and recommend our readers to read this pamphlet, and Mr. Turnbull’s admirable work on Cuba.

The Works of Josephus. Translated by W. WHISTON, A.M. London : Virtue. 1840. Parts 1 and 2.

AN excellent edition, beautifully printed, and adorned with elegant and apposite illustrations. It has also the merit of wonderful cheapness. We hope that it will tend to make the Jewish Historian better known—or if not better known, at least more extensively read.

The History of Popish Transubstantiation. By JOHN COSIN, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham. A new edition, revised, with the authorities printed at full length; to which is added a Memoir of the Author by the Rev. J. S. BREWER, M.A. London: 1840. 12mo.

BISHOP Cosin's History of Transubstantiation has long been known to divines as a standard treatise in the Popish controversy; for which undertaking he was eminently fitted by his profound knowledge of the works of the ancient ecclesiastical writers. While Charles II. was residing at Cologne (having been compelled to retire from France into Germany by the intrigues of Cardinal Mazarine), the English jesuits, who frequented the court, used all their efforts to induce him to embrace popery. Among other arguments, they urged their great dogma of transubstantiation, which (they boasted) had ever been acknowledged as an article of faith in all ages of the Church. In order to determine the question, an appeal was made to Dr. Cosin, at that time residing at Paris, whither he had been driven to avoid the vexatious persecutions of the rebel government of England, for his unflinching loyalty to his sovereign. Accordingly he produced his justly celebrated history of transubstantiation; which, having remained nineteen years in manuscript, was published in Latin, with his consent, by Dr. Durel, at London, in 1675. In the following year it was translated into English by Luke de Beaulieu, and published also at London. This translation Mr. Brewer has reprinted, not without a careful collation of it with the original Latin; and he has further enriched his edition by adding, *at length*, the passages cited or referred to by Bishop Cosin: a work of considerable labour, as the Bishop did not always specify either the chapters or pages of the treatises or other documents which he had consulted. Mr. B. has prefixed a well-written memoir of the learned Prelate, and he has added in an appendix, from a manuscript in the Bodleian Library, an account of two conferences held at York House, in 1625, concerning Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Montague's books; in which the subjects of general councils, the doctrine of justification and good works, of merit and desert, falling from grace, baptism and regeneration, &c., are discussed.

At a time when the papists are exerting themselves to the utmost in the propagation of their unscriptural and anti-scriptural *modern* articles of faith, such a publication as this of Bishop Cosin, which completely exhausts the history of transubstantiation, is peculiarly seasonable. Every theological student will do well to add to his library the present beautifully and accurately printed treatise, which Mr. Brewer has edited with great industry, and in a truly scholar-like manner.

Parliamentary Speeches. Parts 1, 2, 3, 4. London: Painter. 1840.

THERE are few persons in this vast metropolis who have rendered more service to the good old cause of Conservatism than this indefatigable publisher; and there are few schemes for the furtherance of that cause more praiseworthy and more successful than thus publishing the speeches of our best and greatest statesmen. What would we now give for the debates of the Roman senate, or of our own House of Commons during the reign of Elizabeth? Now a newspaper is torn and destroyed, but this series will embalm the Conservative eloquence of our country: and the speeches of a Peel and a Stanley, a Lyndhurst and a Graham, will no longer depend upon tradition. They are, we find, printed on two kinds of paper: one thick, and one manufactured for the purpose, thin enough to go through the post without incurring double postage.

The Book of Illustrations; or, Scripture Truths exhibited by the aid of Similes, original and selected. By the Rev. H. G. SALTER, A.M., Curate and Lecturer of Glastonbury. London: Hatchards. 1840.

AN elegant volume, of which the original portion is original, and the selected part well selected. The preacher, whose style is rather ornate, will do well to avail himself of Mr. Salter's help: his similes will then be both apposite and beautiful. The simile is too much neglected in ordinary preaching. It arrests the attention, and informs the mind of the hearers; it renders easy of apprehension, and easy of comprehension, subjects which, when treated in the too plain manner of our day, fail to strike the mind at all; and the volume before us, while it supplies a copious fund, furnishes also assistance in the way of using them.

Travels in the Holy Land. By M. DE GERAMB, Monk of La Trappe. London: Colburn. 1840.

WE have gone over the Holy Land with the imaginative La Martine, and with the scarcely less poetical Lord Lindsay. We know, as it seems, every nook about Jerusalem, and turn to each new description as though it told us of the scenes familiar to our childhood. With such feelings we opened the volumes before us, and though the mind of the accomplished author is deeply tinged with the asceticism of his order, his work is characterized by sound sense, and a ready knowledge of the world. We have derived much information and much gratification from M. De Geramb's pilgrimage, and only wish that he belonged to a purer church.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Parts 1 to 6.
London: Taylor and Walton. 1840.

THE object of this work is to supply a want which has been long felt. Adam and Potter, good at their time, have, by the advance of philological knowledge, become obsolete, and it is necessary to make large drafts upon our German neighbours. This dictionary is, therefore, a work not uncalled for; and it is with great pleasure we pronounce that the execution is quite satisfactory. Mr. Donaldson, the learned author of the "New Cratylus," Mr. L. Schmitz, from the University of Bonn, and many other eminent scholars are engaged upon this Dictionary; and it is no small advantage to have articles requiring illustration set off by exquisite wood cuts. The typography of the work is clear and elegant: and the first six parts, extending to C, give a very high promise of the rest.

A Manual of Diseases of the Eye, by S. LITTELL, M.D., revised and enlarged by HUGH HOUSTON, M.R.C.S. London: Churchill. 1840.

MEDICAL works are ordinarily so far out of our track, that we are compelled to pass them over without notice. The treatise before us is, however, so important to the student, that we feel ourselves induced to swerve from our usual plan, and recommend it to the general reader. The preservation of the eye is a matter of so great moment, especially to the studious man, and the information in Mr. Houston's volume so valuable, that we shall render our readers a service by calling their attention to it.

The Life and Times of Martin Luther. By the Author of "Three Experiments in Living." London: Green. 1840.

WE are glad to see standard American works reprinted in England. The one before us is by a lady, and is highly meritorious. It is in the form of a tale: but the fictitious parts are only as much as were necessary to connect the history of the great Reformer and his friends into a pleasing and instructive narrative.

Sonnets written strictly in the Italian style; to which is prefixed an Essay on Sonnet writing, by the Rev. WILLIAM PULLING, M.A., A.L.S., Sid. Suss. Coll. Cam. Rector of Dymchurch and Blackmanstone, Kent. London: Bohn. 1840.

IN this little volume the admirer of the sonnet will find an excellent essay, and much curious research. The sonnets of Mr. Pulling himself do not, however, soar above mediocrity; and this is more obvious, as, in his interesting essay prefixed, he has given some of the most beautiful sonnets of Petrarca, Sidney, Shakspeare, Daniels, and Drayton.

The Domestic Altar ; or Prayers for the use of Families for one Month. By EBENEZER TEMPLE. London : Ward. 1839.

WE have seen many forms of domestic prayer, but none that we prefer to this, though it be written by a dissenter. There are here and there expressions which a churchman will deem it necessary to alter : but the whole volume breathes the spirit of Catholic charity.

Biblical Topography : Lectures on the Position and Character of the Places mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, with maps. By SAMUEL RANSOM, &c. &c., with a Preface by JOHN HARRIS, D.D. London : Ward. 1840.

MR. RANSOM has exerted himself to very good purpose, and has given in these lectures a concise account of sacred typography. We do not know any other work on this subject, though we have been given to understand that it was some time ago in contemplation to publish such a work under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Meantime we are glad to see so good a manual as the present.

SERMONS.

1. *Plain Sermons preached to Country Congregations.* By FRANCIS FOREMAN CLARK, A.B. London : Hatchards. 1840.
2. *Sermons preached in St. Paul's Chapel, Stonehouse, &c. &c.* By JAMES COOPER, M.A., minister of St. Paul's Chapel, Stonehouse. London : Hatchards. 1840.
3. *Sermons on Practical Subjects, chiefly preached in the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin.* By the Rev. JOHN CLARKE CROSTHWAITE, A.M., T.C.D., &c. &c. London : Rivingtons. 1840.
4. *Continental Sermons ; or, Nine Discourses addressed to Congregations on the Continent.* By J. HARTLEY, M.A., British Chaplain at Nice. London : Nisbet. 1840.

WE have here four volumes of sermons, of each of which we can say that it is admirably adapted to its end. Sermon writing is now much more generally studied, and we are so much benefited by this extended study among the clergy, that the standard of public taste is raised as well as the quality of the compositions published. Purer doctrines, more faithful addresses, and more correct language can hardly be required than those which now emanate from our pulpits. Mr. Crosthwaite has long been known as a theologian of no common order, and this volume of sermons will not diminish his high reputation. Mr. Cooper, Mr. Clarke, and Mr. Hartley deserve also the thanks of the religious world for the publication of these sermons.

The History of England from the Accession to the Decease of King George the Third. By JOHN ADOLPHUS, Esq. London: Lee. 1840.

THIS very important work makes its appearance at a seasonable time. The life of that venerable King, George III., and the history of his reign possess an interest not derivable merely from the sixty eventful years which they include, but from the truly English character of the "Christian gentleman on the Throne"—our hearts go with Mr. Adolphus while he dwells on the virtues and the accomplishments of a sovereign whom "Whigs may hate and infidels despise," but whose memory will be held in reverence by every true patriot. We have here a true, because a conservative history of a true, because a conservative king. We shall notice the volumes as they appear, and shall, when the work is complete, enter at large on the light which it throws on the life and reign of George the Third.

We are sorry to see so small a list of subscribers. Every one, who wishes to see a *fair* history of the most interesting reign in the British annals, must look to Mr. Adolphus; and we certainly did expect to see all the Conservative members of the bar and of both Houses among the number.

The History of the University of Cambridge, from the Conquest to the year 1634. By THOMAS FULLER, D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles II., and Prebendary of Sarum. Edited by the late REV. MARMADUKE PRICKETT, M.A., F.S.A., Chaplain of Trin. Coll. and THOMAS WRIGHT, Esq. M.A., F.S.A., &c., &c., of Trin. Coll. with Illustrative Notes. Cambridge: Deighton. 1840.

WE shall say little on this book at present, save to recommend it to the reader. We shall very shortly enter at large into the history and present state of Cambridge; and shall then recur to this very admirable edition of Fuller's work. We are given to understand that Mr. Russell, the vicar of Caxton, is engaged on a life of its author, which will shortly appear.

Triplicity. Two vols. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1840.
IN this work we can only praise the intention, therefore the less we say the better.

An Apology for Cathedral Service. London: Bohn. 1840.

WE might well content ourselves by parodying that celebrated exclamation of the venerable George III. "Apology for the Bible? I didn't know that the Bible wanted any apology." Much that we find in this volume we cordially approve; but the author is fond of flippancy, which he unfortunately mistakes for wit.

Pere la Chaise; or, the Confessor. A Tale of the Times. Edited by GEORGE STEPHENS, Esq. author of the Introduction to the Church of England Quarterly Review, and subsequent articles. In 3 vols. London: Whittaker. 1840.

WE are no admirers of religious novels; they are, for the most part, written in advocacy of false doctrine, heresy, and schism, of excited feelings, and of all that is substituted by the fanatic and the enthusiast for true religion. The religious novel has, lately, been adopted by the Romanists, to inculcate the dogmas of their heresy, and on this ground, and because *their* works (of which, in our last, we noticed a specimen, “splendide mendax,”) have been the means of perverting not a few, Mr. Stephens has written the present volumes. That they are clear and argumentative, is only giving them half the praise they deserve, for the narrative is as interesting as the reasoning is cogent. If we had the pleasure to meet with many works of this kind, the term “religious novel” would soon cease to be one almost amounting to reproach, and much good would be effected among parties who would shrink from perusing tomes of professed controversy. If any of our readers have been struck with the specious sophistries of “Geraldine,” we would say “audi alteram partem,” read “Pere la Chaise,” and we are convinced that the result would be a conviction, not only that the Protestant had the better cause, but also that he pleaded it the best.

Messiah the Prince; or the Mediatorial Dominion of Jesus Christ. By WILLIAM LYMINGTON, D.D., Minister of the first reformed Presbyterian congregation, Glasgow; and author of a Treatise on the Atonement and Intercession of Christ. Second edition. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1840.

THE general tone and tendency of this work is such as we can cordially approve—the author treats first of the necessity, and next of the reality of the mediatorial kingdom. He then proceeds to point out the qualifications of the Redeemer to be the Mediator, passes next to the universality and spirituality of that dominion, and considers then the rule of the Messiah as affecting, first, the Church, and secondly, the nations of the world; and the work concludes with a very well written chapter on the Perpetuity of Christ’s kingdom. While we give our approbation to the *general tone and tendency* of this work, we must remark that it is written by a Presbyterian, and that consequently it takes views of the Church and of Ordination (and both subjects are brought prominently forward) to which we cannot at all agree.

VOL. VIII.—R

Views of the Architecture of the Heavens; in a series of Letters to a Lady. By J. P. NICHOL, L.L.D., F.R.S., &c., Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow. Third edition. Edinburgh: Tait. 1839.

THE extraordinary discoveries of modern astronomy, which make it at once the most sublime and the most certain of sciences, are of a character which appeal more forcibly to the imagination than those of past ages. To be told that the sun was the centre of our planetary system, and that round him revolved all his majestic attendants, of which our world formed but a small part, was, however important, in point of science, but the revival of an old doctrine. Newton proved this and many other most essential facts; he laid the vast foundation for that superstructure now building up by Herschell and Airy—but the poetry of astronomy is connected with the superstructure, and not with the foundation; and in the work before us we have a popular view of “those glorious plains studded with stars of light.” The mysteries of the fixed stars—their revolutions round one another in the binary systems—glimpses into the vast constitution of the universe—some faint notions of those dimly seen masses, awful for their tremendous magnitude, and which, to us, are but known as Nebulæ; these form the subjects of Professor Nichol’s volume. With regard to the execution, we have every reason to be satisfied with it, for though no human language can do justice to the sublimity of themes, such as are these, yet that of Dr. Nichol is at once chaste and impressive. The present volume has the great advantage of being written by a practical and scientific astronomer. Others might have written the book as well, but it would not have been so *trustworthy*. It is addressed to a lady, but gentlemen will find it both useful and interesting.

Christ and Anti-Christ: a Poem in Seven Cantos. By a LAYMAN, &c., &c. Respectfully dedicated to the people of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. London: Nisbet. 1840.

WE do not wish to be severe; but we are compelled to say that there is no poetry in this volume. Had it been written in prose, it might have made a decent essay, though even then we could not have praised it very highly.

Cardinal Bellarmine’s Notes of the Church, examined and confuted. Part V. London: Holdsworth. 1840.

THIS work “progresses,” to use an Americanism, very satisfactorily. Part V. contains much interesting matter, and concludes vol. I.

Thoughts on the Litany. By a Naval Officer's Orphan Daughter. Edited by the Rev. GEORGE HEATON, M.A., of Catherine Hall, Cambridge; Chaplain of West Ham Union, and Assistant Minister of St. Olave's, Hart-street. London: Painter. 1840.

AMONG the many volumes which our admirable Liturgy has elicited, so much the greater proportion are mere commonplace, that it is really, as Wordsworth observes, "refreshing" to find a book, which throws any new light upon old doctrines, or which sets those doctrines in a point of view more adapted to make them generally understood. "The Thoughts on the Litany" before us belong to this latter class—the writer possesses great powers of discrimination—she seizes upon the most prominent points, and sets them in the clearest light. We should find it difficult to give a better analysis of "false doctrine, heresy, and schism," than we perceive is given in page 99 of this treatise:—

"From this union (hardness of heart and contempt of God's holy word and commandment) springs that progeny of false doctrine, heresy, and schism, so baneful to the Unity of the Christian Church. The mind, thus influenced, in its worst estate, despises revelation altogether, and, of course, all the ordinances of religion. But there is another state of mind, from which religious notions and obligations are far from being professedly expatriated. In this state man sets up for himself, as more congenial to his own views, other doctrine than that of Christ, taking some one passage, perhaps two, of the Gospel, and enlarging upon this fragment, to the exclusion of all the rest—hence *false doctrine*; he then raises questions in support of his own pride and self-sufficiency—hence *heresy*; the evil gathering strength, explodes at last, in a division, a rending asunder of the body of Christ—hence *schism*. A sin so venial in general estimation, that, although separation in the Christian family is almost ever in unison with licentiousness of practice, it is actually by some perverted to mean a determination on purity and holiness of life; by others, sanctioned as a throwing off of spiritual restraints, which interfere with the conscientious practice of faith."

An Examination of the Ancient Orthography of the Jews; and of the Original State of the Text of the Hebrew Bible. Part the Second. By CHARLES WILLIAM WALL, D.D., Sen. Fellow of Trin. Coll. and Professor of Hebrew in the University of Dublin. London: Whittaker. 1840.

THE object of Dr. Wall, in the present volume, is to show the vast inferiority of ideagraphic to alphabetical or phonetic writing. In the former he endeavoured, and with no small success, to establish the miraculous origin of the latter. We shall reserve our remarks on this very important work till the appearance of the third and concluding volume which may, we are glad to hear, be expected before the close of the present year.

Hymns in Prose for Children. By MRS. BARBAULD. A New Edition, with additional Hymns by the WIFE OF A CLERGYMAN. London : Painter. 1840.

IN an age like the present, when education is so much and so justly the subject of anxious interest, it is with feelings of great pleasure, that we hail any appearance of sound principle, combined with effective ability, to be employed in this great work. There exists, still, a great want of books, which may be safely put into the hands of children; and, alas, so strong is the demand, and so much is it a matter of mere merchandize, that the political radicalism of "Peter Parley," and the spiritual radicalism of "Peep of Day," still continue to glut the market, to the deterring from writing those who have both the will and the power to benefit the rising generation. In spite of this somewhat discouraging prospect, the lady whose work forms the subject of our present remarks, has come forward with her new edition of Mrs. Barbauld. The book is small and unpretending, without clap-trap or puff, and yet we venture to predict for it a permanence enjoyed by few works. We must first make some remarks upon Mrs. Barbauld, and then proceed to notice, very briefly, the task so admirably executed by "the Clergyman's Wife." Mrs. Barbauld was a lady whose abilities were of a pre-eminent order, but who was, unfortunately, deeply imbued with Unitarian principles. It is somewhat remarkable and highly to her credit, that in her *Prose Hymns for Children* she has only offended negatively against orthodoxy; and the book, as she left it, though insufficient, was yet by no means dangerous. In spite of her omissions, the hymns deserved and obtained a very extensive sale, they were so admirably adapted to the youthful mind, so qualified to induce a pure taste, and a spirit of devotion at the same time, that many families unhesitatingly adopted them, notwithstanding the avowed Arianism of their gifted authoress. Indeed there was no choice—either the dissident poetry of the dissenting Dr. Watts, or the true poetry of the dissenting Mrs. Barbauld—the one would certainly spoil the taste, the other as certainly preserve and improve it. In the present day the choice is no greater; and till this work appeared, which is but, we believe, a few days ago, we had only to choose between incomplete theology and bad taste. Now we have the want supplied—the additional hymns are so beautiful that we unhesitatingly pronounce them equal to Mrs. Barbauld, and they are both orthodox and highly devotional. Take as a specimen Hymn X. :—

" THE BUTTERFLY.

" I saw the butterfly sporting in the sunshine; its wings were of

purple and gold, and when it alighted upon the flowers their colours were out-shone by its own.

"I beheld it and rejoiced, for it was very beautiful; the hand of the Almighty had fashioned it, to show forth his power and his glory.

"I looked and the swallow seized it, and lo, it was devoured: I saw the hawk pursuing the swallow, and the hare fleeing before the hound.

"There are lands where the lion devoureth the ox, and the leopard the kid; where the snake lies hid among the long grass, and the venomous reptile glideth among the bright green leaves.

"Man is the lord of the creation, but these own not his sway; they have torn him in pieces when there was none to deliver him. The serpent hath bitten him, and he has died.

"Dost thou grieve because thou hast seen these things? and knowest thou not that man, too, devoureth his brother, and despoileth his neighbour? He is more cruel than the wolf, and more insatiable than the tiger.

"There was a time when the swallow did not chase the butterfly, nor the hawk pursue the swallow; when the lion was at peace with the ox, and the leopard harmed not the kid.

"The earth was filled with love, and man ruled over all in the image of God.

"That time was before sin came into this world; before man had offended his Maker; and it shall be again when sin hath ceased to pollute the earth.

"There is war throughout all nature through the sin of man; it is on this account that the eagle is the terror of the dove, and the wolf of the fold; it is through this, that murder and robbery stalk abroad, and that man trembleth before his fellow.

"Dost thou grieve for these things? Grieve then, for they are very dreadful. Yet, let thy grief be mingled with joy, for peace hath been proclaimed on earth. Our divine Lord Jesus Christ hath proclaimed it.

"His spirit is stronger than sin, and he will keep those who love him from it: his love is stronger than death, and those who serve him shall live for ever in heaven.

"Mourn not then as though there were no hope. Though war may prevail here, it shall not prevail against us, if he be with us. Though sin rule among the disobedient, it shall not rule over us, if we serve him.

"He was God over all, blessed for evermore; yet he loved us, and came and dwelt among men: he suffered that we might escape suffering; he died that we might escape eternal death.

"Let us love him, for he hath been very good unto us: let us give him our hearts, for he is our Saviour; let us give him our worship, for he is our God!"

Already has the work of patronage commenced. Her most gracious Majesty, the Queen Dowager, has commanded six copies to be sent to her; and we both expect and hope, that in a very short time, no other edition of Mrs. Barbauld will be used.

1. *The Early English Church.* By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Rector of Crayke, Durham. London: Burns. 1840.
2. *Tales of the Village.* By FRANCIS E. PAGET, M.A., Rector of Elford and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. London: Burns. 1840.

THESE two volumes form the 8th and 9th numbers of the Englishman's Library—a series which increases in interest as it advances. That of Mr. Churton is decidedly the most delightful sketch of ecclesiastical history we ever read. It is correct, well written, and concise. We tender to the Rectors of Crayke and Elford the thanks of the Church.

The New Testament. Translated from the text of J. J. GRIESBACH, by SAMUEL SHARPE. London: Green. 1840.

THE text of Griesbach is so very valuable, and in such high request among scholars, that we were very glad to see a translation of it, for the use of those who, though feeling an interest in the subject of translations and versions, were yet unable to read the original text for themselves. It appears that the chief use of a translation, *like this*, will be for dissenting ministers, who will thus be enabled, without a knowledge of Greek, to see wherein the most eminent of German New Testament critics differ from the authorized version. We say this will be the chief use of a translation like the present, but it would have been easy to have made a far more valuable work than it is. The translator was not bound to the phraseology of our authorized version, and ought, where it was in the slightest degree incorrect, to have changed it. His book was not to be read in churches, nor to be circulated among the poor; there would, therefore, have been no evil precedent set, and the slightest inaccuracy should have been by him amended. Why, for instance, did he not change the translation of that wonderful passage of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 44. σπείρεται σωμα ψυχικόν ἐγείρεται σωμα πνευματικόν, did he confound ψυχικόν with φυσικόν, as it would seem our translators did? He should have rendered the passage: "It is sown a soul-informed body, it is raised an ethereal body." Many metaphysical disquisitions would have been obviated, had this translation been adopted in the time of James I., and though we are far from wishing for a new translation, the effect of which could only be to show that the old is better; yet, in an undertaking like the present, there is no ground for retaining *any* error. Again, why not render the word *ασκος*, in Luke v. 37, a *wine skin*, and not a *bottle*?

Had the translator taken up this line, he would have done a service to many; as it is, we can scarcely compliment him on the volume he has produced.

A Refutation of the first Report of the Constabulary Force Commissioners. By the Rev. C. D. BRERETON, A.M., Rector of Little Massingham, Norfolk. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1840.

WE are not inclined to enter at large into the somewhat difficult question—"Is a rural police expedient?" We agree with Mr. Brereton, that it is not universally called for; while, at the same time, we feel well assured that, in the manufacturing districts, it is absolutely necessary. No one, however, who feels interested in the subject should neglect examining Mr. Brereton's evidence.

Tracts on the Church and the Prayer Book. By the Rev. FRED. U. FABER, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

THERE is more than semi-Popery here. Mr. Newman would have thought twice before he published such a passage as this: "By alms do we absolve ourselves from sin. Alms, as one of the ancients teaches, are a second baptism."—p. 34, No. 1. This may be the doctrine of Oxford, but it is any thing but the doctrine of Christ.

Tracts of the Anglican Fathers. Nos. 11, 12, 13. London: Painter.

THIS series is slowly, but satisfactorily, advancing. No. 11. is Bishop Sanderson on the Divine Right of the Episcopate not prejudicial to the supreme authority of the Civil Ruler. No. 12. The Points of Difference, and Agreement between the Churches of England and Rome, by Bishop Cosin; and No. 13. Bishop Sparrow, on the Authority of the Church, in Matters of Discipline and Faith. There can be but one opinion as to the republication of these admirable Tracts, and though they have, by some, been branded with the stigma of being auxiliary to the "Tracts for the Times," because they proceed from followers and favourers of those Tracts, we must take exception to this conclusion, and put the two on their proper basis. The "Tracts for the Times" tell us what Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and their friends *think* of the Anglican Fathers; the present series tell us *what those Fathers thought for themselves*. Had these Tracts been published *instead* of the "Tracts for the Times," the Church would have been spared many divisions, and not a little *heresy*. We can willingly agree with a Cosin or a Sanderson, when we are not so inclined to yield to the judgment of our zealous—over-zealous contemporaries.

The Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk. By Sir ARCHIBALD EDMONSTONE, Bart., London: Burns. 1840.

A pleasing addition to Mr. Roberts delightful volume, the Portraiture of a Christian gentleman, and to the still more valuable portraiture of a English Churchman by Gresley.

Outlines of China: presenting a popular view of its History, Arts, Productions, and Social Characteristics—of the British Relations with China, and the Opium Trade—and the Origin and Causes of of the War. By ROBERT BELL, Esq., Author of "The History of Russia," "The Lives of the Poets," &c.—Reprinted from the *Atlas Weekly Newspaper*. London: T. H. Brown.

If a great book be a great evil, and not unfrequently is this the case, then Mr. Bell has, at all events, abstained from inflicting a "great evil" upon us.

But the tract (for in size it is no more) which is here announced contains so much real and authentic information on China and Chinese matters, that we can cordially recommend it in preference to many bulky volumes. The Chinese seem resolved on war.

— tantæ ne animis cœlestibus iræ ?

and the rise and causes of that war are well detailed. As to the celestial literature of the "central flowery land," Mr. Bell would have very much improved his little work had he consulted for that department, the "*Horæ Sinicæ*," published at various times in *Fraser's Magazine*. We are glad to see it in its present shape, for it is decidedly too valuable to be left in the perishable columns of a newspaper, even though that newspaper be an *Atlas*, where we should most naturally look for the outlines of China.

A Life of Socrates. By Dr. G. WIGGERS. Translated from the German, with notes. London: Taylor and Walton. 1840.

THIS excellent translation of a learned and interesting work is accompanied by the Life of Socrates, by Diogenes Laertius, in the original, and with useful and apposite notes. It is calculated to give a greater interest to this book, to know that the translation as well as the original, is the work of a young but learned German, Mr. L. Schmitz, of Bonn, who is also engaged in communicating papers to the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Mr. Schmitz has made himself so fully master of the English language, that the present work might be taken for that of an accomplished Englishman: there are no *Germanisms*; and this is, however, not half the praise which the translator deserves; he has given us an interesting and useful book.

A Treatise on the Pastoral Care. By GILBERT BURNETT, late Lord Bishop of Sarum, with a Preface by the Rev. T. DALE. London: Washbourne. 1840.

It would be quite needless to say how valuable a work is that of the good Bishop of Sarum; or to say how much that value is increased by the excellent preface of Mr. Dale. These propositions are self evident.

Memoir of the Rev. Henry Mowes, late Pastor of Altenhausen and Ivenrode, Prussia, &c., &c., with an Introduction by the Rev. J. DAVIES, B.D., Rector of Gateshead, Durham. London: Hatchards. 1840.

THE life of Mowes was one of less stirring interest than those of Neff or Oberlin: but the man was of the same order. No one can attentively read it without being improved, and the practical tendency of the volume, the applicability of its remarks to the wants and feelings of good men, at all times and in all countries, makes it well worthy of a niche in the Christian's library.

The Prelate. A Novel. 2 vols. London: Boone. 1840.

THIS novel is advertised as "by the Rev. S. Smith." The public are expected to believe that S. stands for Sidney. Now, though Sidney Smith is a Whig, more's the pity; he is a man of undoubted ability, of genuine humour, and strong, though sometimes sophistical, argumentation. The Rev. S. Smith, on the other hand, though a Whig, also has no further resemblance to his distinguished namesake. In thus speaking, we do not mean to deny that there is considerable talent displayed in the novel before us; there undoubtedly is, and not a few sketches which would be worthy of Sidney Smith himself, albeit the latter has pointedly denied, in a letter to the Editor of the *Times*, that HE has had anything to do with it. What we disapprove is, the unchristian spirit, the dishonest representations abounding throughout, the sneers at the higher orders among the clergy—nay, at all orders among them—the bitter Whig-Radicalism that, from time to time, breaks out. Is it likely that the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge would refuse permission to a "poor devil of a sizar," to go to see a sick mother, or rusticate him if he did so *without* leave? Does the author of "*The Prelate*" know no better than to suppose Professors and Masters of Colleges to talk like over-heated fanatical Dissenters? or than to concede the title "Catholic" to the Romanist exclusively? The author is not devoid of ability, though he ought to be heartily ashamed of his present production.

Sorrow and Consolation; or, The Gospel preached under the Cross. By J. H. GRANDPIERRE, D.D. Translated from the French by a Lady. London: Nisbet. 1840.

THESE Sermons are very good and very evangelical; they are, moreover, well translated, which is not a matter of so much facility as is sometimes supposed.

Party Politics and Political Prospects. A Letter to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., M.P. London: Painter. 1840.

PAMPHLETS on political subjects are usually ephemeral in their character; they take a glance, more or less correct, of the general position of affairs, and set in a more or less vivid light the faults or the excellencies of existing arrangements, or of the governing ministry. When those arrangements are superseded, or that ministry out of office, the day of the brochure is past, and its fate is usually known best to the grocer and trunk-maker. In this pamphlet, however, a different line is followed: a very able retrospect is taken, not of Lord Melbourne's ministry only—but of the Whigs, from the time of Queen Anne, downwards; not only of our present opposition—but of Conservatives from the same period. Lord Bolingbroke furnishes a text, whereby Whigs of all ages are proved to be alike actuated by the same paltry motives, and following the same factious polity. It is a slight but masterly sketch of the History of Faction; and those who wish to understand the present position of parties, will do well to read the series of sketches given in these highly interesting pages.

Ingliston: a Tale. By GRACE WEBSTER. Edinburgh: Tait. 1840

Miss Webster, in the tale before us, has walked in no untrodden field; for, though she has neither followed the steps of Scott and James, in describing the days gone by; nor those of Mrs. Gore and Lady Stepney, in depicting the fashionable manners of our own time, still her work has its predecessors in the beautiful romances of John Wilson.

“Non fumum ex fulgore sed e fumo dare lucem,”

is a good motto, and one which Miss Webster has practised; the commencement of the tale is ill managed, and we had little expectation to find either so interesting a narrative, or so much of a truly Christian spirit in the subsequent pages. The picture of Margaret Inglis, worn out with many sorrows, and at last reduced to abject want, yet ever supported by the high and holy consolations of religion, is touching, and very beautifully drawn; and, alas! for the professing world, too just, also, is the portraiture of Mr. Bland. We shall content ourselves with recommending it as one of the best of its class.

The Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches. London: Burns. 1840.

A very neat edition, and one which we should be glad to see used, that is *sung*, in every Church, and by every member of the congregation.

Nautical Sketches. By HAMILTON MOORE, JUN. London: Painter.

As a book of mere amusement, without any admixture of mischievous matter, we have no hesitation in recommending these sketches. There is a vivid distinctness about them, which brings us at once to the cock-pit and the quarter-deck, which familiarizes us with the light hearts and warm feelings of our best and bravest defenders. It is, we think, a good sign of the times, that our navy attracts so much attention—Admiral Sir Jahleel Brenton, Captains Sir Nesbit Willoughby, Marryat, and Basil Hall, have done much to effect this. Naval history, naval sketches, naval novels, naval essays, sermons to seamen, hospitals for seamen—all have become popular since the commencement of the last reign. The personal character of William IV., so frank and thoroughly honest, so benevolent and so truly British, made him beloved by all classes and conditions of men, and a portion of that love reflected on the naval service, has, we rejoice to think, been steadily increasing. Would that it would show itself in making some spiritual provision for our sailors! But we are forgetting Hamilton Moore, Jun., whose pleasant volume has elicited these thoughts, and to whom we cordially wish success, both in literature and in his profession.

The Alphabet explained: or the Science of Articulate Sounds. By the Rev. JAMES BRODIE, A.M. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1840.

Mr. Brodie has, in this unpretending, but learned volume, given us an excellent theory of pronunciation; the facts which he adduces, and the conclusions at which he arrives, are alike creditable to his research and his judgment—the book is one which may be read with great pleasure, and will be full of interest to the student who wishes to investigate the antiquities of the English language; or, indeed, those of the Greek and Roman tongues. While noticing the proofs afforded, that the pronunciation of the Roman *v* resembled that of the English *w*, we wonder that the word “went” did not suggest its derivation from “*venit*,” a derivation the more remarkable, as the signification is derived from another verb. Many interesting papers might be written on this able work, but our limits will forbid our further enlarging.

The Universal Tendency to Association in Mankind Analyzed and Illustrated. By JOHN DUNLOP, Esq. London: Houlston and Stoneman. 1840.

MR. DUNLOP has, we rejoice to find, forsaken the path of fictitious narrative, and betaken himself to his old field of statistics; here we are always glad to meet him, and cordially approve this present volume.

On the Nobility of the British Gentry ; or the Political Ranks and Dignities of the British Empire. By Sir JAMES LAWRENCE, Knight of Malta. London : Fraser. 1840.

SOME years ago, certain "English gentlemen," who gloried in the title, and refused to assume any other, were introduced at the Court of St. Petersburg ; at a dinner given by a Russian nobleman, these gentlemen had demanded of them their ranks ; they replied "English gentlemen !" whereupon they were very coolly thrust to the bottom of the table by Counts, Barons, and Marquises, innumerable. To remedy such inconveniences and to explain fully the style which an English gentleman has a right to assume, Sir James Lawrence has given us a little book, in which we find as much information as could be desired and in a very small compass. He proves, satisfactorily, that every person *entitled* to arms, is noble ; that every person whose great grandfather was entitled to arms, is a gentleman ; and thus that the title gentleman is superior to that of nobleman. A prince may make one, but he cannot make the other ; and Seldon, in his "Table Talk," profanely remarks, that a gentleman is the only thing which God Almighty cannot make. The nurse of James I., who had followed him from Edinburgh to London, entreated him to make her son a gentleman. "My good woman," said the King, "a gentleman I could never make him, though I could make him a lord." We can, with great pleasure, recommend this book to our *untitled gentry*, fully assured that it will give them satisfaction.

Jephthah ; or the Maid of Gilead. Edinburgh : Johnstone. 1840.

THE author has done well in sending forth this production anonymously. He may by and by write something respectable ; and we are inclined to think, with a celebrated critic, that if he will but be pleased entirely to change his manner of writing and thinking, we may perhaps be well satisfied with his works. The present specimen is written in particularly inflated prose, and much reminds us of a "Poem" which we once happened to see, called the "Death of Cain," and wherein, by way of exemplifying the very affectionate disposition of that renowned patriarch, we found this exquisite sentence—"Nor was Cain remiss in forming a periphery of his arms around the waist of his gentle spouse." The "Maid of Jephthah" is not quite so learned as the "Death of Cain," but it is every whit as poetical.

1. *Aid to Devotion*. London: Dalton. 1840.
2. *Christian Consolations taught from Five Heads in Religion*. By JOHN HACKET, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. London: Burns. 1840.
3. *Pictures of Religion and Religious Truth*. From the Works of Taylor, Leighton, &c. London: Burns. 1840.

THE above are all reprints, and are, therefore, already well known. The first is less meritorious than the other two. Mr. Burns is doing great service to the Church, and we wish him success in these selections and reprints.

PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, AND SINGLE SERMONS.

1. *On the Principles of Common or Inactive Discipline*; the Eighth of a Series of Letters to a Brother Curate, on Professional Topics of various interest and importance. By a SUPERNUMERARY. London: Cadell. 1840.
2. *Transubstantiation and the Romish Sacrifice of the Mass*: a Sermon preached in St. Leonard's Church, Bilston, on Tuesday evening, March 10, 1840. By the Rev. J. W. WHITTAKER, D.D., Vicar of Blackburn. Wolverhampton: Simpson. 1840.
3. *Popery; Practical, Past, Present, and Prospective*: a Tract for all Times. By the Rev. FRED. A. GLOVER, M.A., Rector of Charlton in Dover. London: Roake and Varty. 1840.
4. *The Anglo-Catholic Use of Two Lights upon the Altar*, for the signification that Christ is the very True Light of the World, stated and defended. By GEO. AYLIFFE POOLE, M.A., Incumbent of St. James's Church, Leeds. London: Burns. 1840.
5. *Essay on the Utility, Origin, and Progress of Writing*. By F. BOLINBROKE RIBBANS, F.S.A., C.C.C., Camb. London: Longman. 1840.
6. *The Dignity and Claims of the Christian Poor*. Two Sermons; the latter preached in aid of the Middlesex Hospital. By FRED. OAKELEY, M.A., &c., &c., &c. London: Burns. 1840.
7. *Tracts on Christian Doctrine and Practice*. London: Burns. 1840.
8. *The City of God*. A Sermon preached in St. Peter's Church, Walworth. By JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, B.C.L. Published by request. London: Burns. 1840.
9. *The Observance of Lent*. A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Uxbridge. By JAMES SKINNER, B.A., University College, Durham. London: Burns. 1840.
10. *Come out of Rome*. A Sermon preached on the behalf of the Protestant Association, in the Parish Church of St. Clement Danes, Strand. By the Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, M.A., Rector of Watton, Herts. London: Seely. 1840.
11. *The Church and the Chapters*. A Letter to the Representatives of the University of Cambridge. London: Ollivier. 1840.
12. *Narratives and Tracts*. 18mo. London: Burns. 1840. Nos. 1 to 6.

13. *A Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration.* By the Right Rev. ALEXANDER JOLLY, D.D., late Bishop of Moray. London: Burns. 1840.
14. *Letter to Thomas Phillips, Esq., R.A.,* on the connection between the Fine Arts and Religion, and the means of their revival. By HENRY DRUMMOND, Esq. London: Fraser. 1840.
15. *A Speech read at the Monthly General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* By the Rev. W. PALMER, M.A. Oxford: Parker. 1840.

It is but a very brief space that we can afford to tracts and pamphlets; yet there are some of those mentioned in the above list that we cannot pass without notice. The Tracts on Christian Doctrine and Practice, and the Narratives and Tracts published by Burns, seem designed to aid the cause advocated by the "Englishman's Library," and we both approve and admire them. Bishop Jolly's excellent "Address on Baptismal Regeneration;" is also reprinted in a larger form, and a well-written memoir appended by the Rev. Patrick Cheyne.

Of Dr. Whittaker's very able sermon (No. 2) it would be difficult to speak in terms of too high praise, and we are much pleased with that of Mr. Bickersteth (No. 10). Those of Mr. Oakley (No. 6) deserve attention; that of Mr. Russell, though possessing much merit, is too Tractarian for our taste. The letters (9, 11, 14), are each very good.

FINE ARTS.

Melancthon's first misgivings of the Church of Rome. Painted by GEORGE LANCE. Engraved by THOMAS LUPTON. London: Leggatt.

THERE are those who tell us that the arts are declining, our architecture is becoming insignificant, our sculpture contemptible, our paintings meretricious, and our engravings mediocre. The "laudatores temporis acti" refer to the National Gallery, both inside and outside, to the paintings of Mr. Turner, and the sculptures of stone-masons, and then coolly ask us, "Whether these are to be compared with St. Peter's or St. Paul's, with Rafael or Michael Angelo, or Claude Lorraine with Phidias or Praxiteles?" Now, we profess to be well satisfied with the existing state of things; we think the New Post Office and the New London Bridge, and the projected Houses of Parliament, to be equal to any buildings of old time. We think Westmacott's exquisite group of "Francesca and Paolo de Rimini" the best basso relievo we know; and we rejoice to find that casts of it are to be had at a moderate price.

Then, again, with regard to Mr. Turner, few people know how those extraordinary pictures of his are produced; but when we have explained the mystery, they will, we think, agree that

no other painter who ever lived could have done the same. Mr. Turner never knows, till his paintings are half-finished, what the subjects of them are to be; he prepares his canvas in the usual manner, he then takes a large brush filled with white-wash, and dashes it against the canvas, without allowing the brush itself to touch it. He then does the same with very liquid mustard, and then the same with a smaller brush filled with vermillion; the next process is to give a dash of ultramarine in the same way, and then, according to the general tour which the colours make, it is decided whether it is to be a land or a sea piece. If there should happen to be a large round spot of mustard, it does for a sun; a similar blot of whitewash makes the painting a moonlight scene—a few masterly strokes with the pencil work up these elements into the outlines of a picture; and thus it is that works of art are produced, upon which the world gazes with astonishment; this, too, accounts for the marvellous transposition of colours we sometimes find in the productions of Mr. Turner. Thus we have, in his “Slaves thrown overboard,” a purple sea covered with green fishes, and copper-coloured negroes; upon which sea, floating through a pink fog, we see a brown ship; while a crimson sun, beaming through a mustard-coloured sky, throws a magical light over the striated scene. When the picture is finished, Mr. Turner dips into a book which is filled with the names of proper subjects, and that which he touches first is the name of the picture. Thus, a sea piece may be the battle of Trafalgar, or it may be a view of a steamer starting from the Tower stairs. To speak, seriously, however, Mr. Turner, with all his eccentricities, is a man of power and genius; and we now turn, with much pleasure, to the engravers of our day—doubtless there is much trash published, but there are also good engravings. The engraving at the head of this article is one, which merits high praise, we shall speak first of the *picture*, to which the Liverpool academy awarded in 1837, a prize of 50*l*. It represents that moment so important to our Protestant Reformation, when Melancthon was first struck with doubt as to the Apostolic character of the Romish Church. Having been lectured by his monastic superior, upon the duty and merits of self-denial, he accidentally passed through that superior’s apartments, when he had fallen into a slumber,—

“*somno vino que gravatus.*”

This is the moment seized by the painter, and it is with no small skill that Mr. Lance has availed himself of the attendant circumstances. On a luxurious chair, by the side of a table, groaning with fruits and wines, with costly but empty vessels at his feet, reclines the preacher of mortification. With extremely

good taste he is depicted, not as a coarse bloated sensualist, the jolly friar of ballads and low novels, but as the intellectual, shrewd, and acute bon-vivant. The one would have *never* occurred to Melancthon as a specimen of Romish ministers—the other justly excited his mistrust. The figure of Melancthon himself is equally to be admired; he stands with a grave and earnest, yet most sorrowful surprise; that splendid and lofty brow, so magnificently intellectual, is finely presented in the picture; and the monastic architecture, the clerical dresses, and all the adjuncts of the painting, are in keeping with the same sweet taste. We can only add that Mr. Lupton has equally excelled in his department—the engraving is worthy of the painting.

Napier Sturt, youngest Son of H. C. Sturt, Esq., M.P., and Lady Charlotte Sturt. Printed by John Lucas. Engraved by C. E. Wagstaff. London: T. Boys. 1840.

THE subject of this engraving is less interesting to the general connoisseur than the last; it is the picture of a beautiful youth—we might rather say a beautiful child. The dog by his side almost approaches to Landseer; and the effect of the whole is extremely good. Mr. and Lady Charlotte Sturt may well be excused publishing, or allowing to be published, this engraving of their beautiful boy. An engraving as creditable to Mr. Wagstaff as the painting is to Mr. Lucas.

A Pictorial Plan of the University and City of Oxford. Drawn by Delamotte. Engraved by Fisher. Oxford: Dewe. London: Tilt. 1840.

OF a plan so new as this we can only speak in terms of praise; it is a very novel and a very pleasing idea; for the colleges, churches, and other public buildings are *depicted* in their respective places. We hope to see this plan followed by similar ones of Cambridge and other picturesque cities.

Illustrations of the Works of Mercy. Parts I. II. III. IV. London: Dolman. 1940.

THESE are very pretty designs by a young lady lately perverted, and are intended to promote the advancement of the Popish nunnery at Bermondsey, to which purpose the profits are to be applied.

Canadian Scenery. Parts IV. and V. London: Virtue. 1840. THESE parts are fully equal to those which preceded them, and we expect that, when complete, the work will be one of the most elegant of its class.

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, MDCCCXL.

- ART. I.—*Lectures on the Church of England, delivered in London, March, 1840.* By the Rev. HUGH McNEILE, M.A., Minister of St. Jude's Church, Liverpool. London: Hatchards. 1840.
2. *The Standard of Catholicity; or an attempt to point out, in a plain manner, certain safe and leading principles amidst the conflicting opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.* By the Rev. G. E. BIBER, L.L.D. London: Parker. 1840.
3. *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches vindicated against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman, in the "Dublin Review."* By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
4. *The Church and Dissent; an Appeal to Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, and other sects, on the Constitution of the Church of England, and the character and unreasonableness of Schism and Dissent.* By the Rev. CHARLES BURTON, L.L.D., F.L.S. London: Hatchards. 1840.

AT the time when what was absurdly called "Catholic Emancipation" was passed, a certain distinguished prelate was asked by a foreigner, what was the meaning of the letters "F. D." at the end of the royal titles. "It did," replied his lordship, "once signify 'Defender of the Faith;' but now it signifies, 'Fiddle-de-dee.'" We have now *many* defenders of the Faith, and but few in whom the Church has reason to put much confidence: there may be, and are, both zeal and talent displayed on her behalf; but no one is qualified to come forward in the cause of the Church, as her defender, unless he be profoundly

versed in her history and antiquities, filled with a pure love for her ordinances, endowed with a cool and sound judgment, and animated by a tolerant and charitable spirit towards those "who are without." For want of one or other of these requisites, most of the attempts made of late years to restore the Church to her true and legitimate position, have not only failed to effect their own object, but have furnished weapons of offence to the adversaries.

It is a fact that cannot be concealed, and must not be denied, that in every age since the Apostolic, the Church at large has given an undue prominence to some one or other point of doctrine or discipline. The point thus especially insisted upon threw other and equally important matters into the shade, and produced gradually either speculative heresy or practical error, according as the subject, thus brought into extreme relief, was a point of doctrine or one of discipline. This is the natural result of human weakness, and it has only been over-ruled by the especial providence of God. When, however, the error, whether speculative or practical, was made apparent to the Church at large, it produced a re-action, and the tendency of the next period was, consequently, to the opposite extreme. Thus has the Church been kept from destruction by a series of actions and re-actions, like a river whose meandering course is caused by the wearing away, first of one bank, and then of the other.

We may take, as an instance of this, the case of our own Anglican Church. But half a century ago, the generality of her clergy were content with the preservation of order; they strenuously resisted innovation, and, provided that all things were thus "done decently," they were willing "to abide in decencies for ever." But when the spirit of a more lively faith began to leaven the whole lump, the formality of the previous period was seen in its true light, and those who contended for evangelical truth became all but despisers of apostolical order. There has been one era in the history of the Anglican Church when a sound state of doctrine and discipline was brought about by extraordinary means—when no such tendency to extremes existed—and this wholesome condition would have continued had it not been for the operation of external causes. The period to which we refer was the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign. The Reformation was established, the Marian persecutions had purified the Church, and the true principles, both of theological system and of ecclesiastical polity, had been elicited and investigated by minds of a gigantic capacity. Popery was renounced, while the unity of the Church was preserved, and the task of guiding the public opinion was committed to intellects so ma-

jestic, that we, at the distance of three centuries, find ourselves obliged, in all cases of doubt, to have recourse to the arguments, and to abide by the decisions of those who completed the Anglican Reformation.

The secret of this is, that the English Reformers were men of the most profound learning, of the most consummate judgment, and of the most Christian spirit; they were not guided by prejudice, and they were aware of the fact that nothing is so much to be deprecated as novelties in religion. They saw that the Church of Rome had erred grievously, and they yet willingly acknowledged that she was not entirely corrupt; they drew the line of distinction between Popery and Catholicity, and made out their claim, not only by their learning, but by their moderation, to be the guides and teachers—the duly authorized pastors and ministers of a Catholic, unschismatical, and orthodox branch of the great undivided and indivisible Catholic Church.

On this account, and because there were few heresiarchs to disturb their labours, the Reformation was, by these great and good men, happily accomplished. But no sooner was the work done than disturbing forces came into active operation. The discipline of Geneva was established in Scotland, and individuals of the same persuasion began to multiply in England. Gifted with a little learning, enough to object, but not enough to investigate the *whole* system against which they objected, they exclaimed at the “rags of Popery” which the Church of England had preserved, and conciliated the people by their tirades against the Romish apostacy. At the same time they assumed the external appearance of superior sanctity, and laid claims to a higher and more spiritual religion than that of the learned and moderate Reformers.

We by no means intend to assert that all, or even the greater part, of these dissidents were insincere in their profession—they may have really imagined that they were as holy, and the Church as unholy, as they represented; and they gave every token of disinterested, though misguided, zeal in the line of conduct they adopted. But even if we allow them all the merit of conscientiousness, we cannot look on them as other than instruments in God’s hand to humble a Church, perhaps, too confident, and a nation too proud. The current of popular feeling became slowly altered—the authority of the Church became the subject of warm discussions—the decisions of the Reformers were disregarded—the long prayers and still longer sermons of the Puritans were looked upon as proofs of true religion—and a stern asceticism took the place of the more rational piety of those who completed the Reformation. We might trace the

onward course of this spirit till it deluged the land with blood, and terminated in the murder of the king, the overthrow of the constitution, and the destruction of the Anglican Church.

We have spoken of a period in which there was no *inherent* tendency to extremes. We are now looking forward to the coming of another similar period, and the prognosis is the more favourable, inasmuch as the disturbing causes which then interfered are now dying away: they were at that time in their infancy, gathering strength from all the circumstances of the times; they are now in their decrepitude—they prevail no more in the minds of the multitude, and each succeeding year diminishes their effects. There are, however, *other* disturbing causes, from which that age was free, and of these we shall treat briefly in the present article.

When the spirit of vital religion, of which we have just spoken, began to prevail in the middle of the last century, and a new school of theologians occupied the area of controversy, it was to be expected that a new religious literature would also arise—a literature, distinguished as much by warmth and fervour, as by smallness of theological attainment and deficiency of logical acumen. Those few who had been brought up at the feet of our English Gamaliels stood apart from the field—they saw that the formalists and the experimentalists were waging a hot controversy, and they knew that both were in the wrong—they themselves were the beacon-lights of divinity, and they shone; they were the theological champions, but they stood aloof to let the controversy exhaust itself, feeling convinced that, whichever way it terminated, the *Church* would ultimately triumph. From time to time their ranks were augmented by those who had been led to think and to *study*, who perceived that the questions in dispute were misunderstood, and who were at last persuaded that the key to the whole difficulty lay in the writings of the Anglican Fathers.

While these secessions were thus continually taking place, the dispute itself was acquiring a new character—the pervading spirit of vital Christianity was at work among both parties, and both became gradually more and more earnest, not only in defence of their own peculiarities, but also in the *salvation of souls*. The controversy, therefore, that had begun about the necessity and nature of conversion, now assumed a more polemic and less practical tone: the importance of apostolical discipline, the oft-disputed question of election—the authority of the Church—the meaning of the articles; these became the subjects of dispute, and they were, for the most part, handled by men who, if right, knew not that their own sentiments had been far more

ably defended before; and, if wrong, were, at least, guiltless of the knowledge that their errors had been a thousand times refuted. This is all natural and usual: the men who wage paper wars, and who carry on controversies in religious periodicals, and by means of tracts, sermons, and pamphlets, are not those who sit down and *study* such writers as Jewel, and Hooker, and Bingham, and Collier. No; their systems are all *αὐτοχθόνες*—they spring solely from their own brain, and partake, consequently, of its weakness and lightness—their productions are altogether ephemeral, and their influence extends no further than their own circle, or, at most, their own day of popularity.

And now we have another æra in this long and important, though ill-conducted dispute—a new and better-informed class of disputants have arisen on *either* side, and the “Tracts for the Times” have been met by Isaac Taylor and a band of controversialists, who, like himself, are disposed to appeal to antiquity. The appeal has been made, though neither honestly nor successfully, and this we feel inclined to hope is the last stand that can be made, either by one party or the other. . The clergy at large, and the better informed among the laity, are investigating for themselves, and gradually the conviction is spreading, that neither formalist nor fanatic—neither Papist nor semi-Papist, nor ultra-Protestant, can abide the test of an appeal to Catholic antiquity: and those only are able to look with satisfaction towards the termination of the controversy who are **EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN.**

We have said that those who are best qualified to decide are standing aloof, and waiting till the warfare shall have expended itself and both parties be proved alike in the wrong; but, in the meantime, while we are quite convinced as to what the issue will be, and while we quite acquiesce in the silence which refuses to say what our great divines have already said so well, it is necessary for *us* to notice the self-dubbed *Defenders of the Faith*, who, from time to time—

“ Presume to lay their hands upon the ark
Of Her magnificent and awful cause.”

And these divide themselves into such as, having read a little, and thought a little more, jump to a conclusion; and those who, having attentively examined the records of Christian antiquity, give us, in these days of supposed light, some rays from the glory of old times.

Now, in the first of these classes, though with many palliating circumstances, do we place Mr. McNeile. Possessed of great

natural elocution, a commanding person, a magnificent voice, and talent of a very high order, he soon acquired a reputation as a preacher excelled by few ; he was well acquainted with the dispute between Papists and Protestants, as managed by men of the Gregg and M'Guire school, and had been, in his own country and University, taught to look upon Popery as the *one* thing to be avoided. As a public disputant, his success has been ever commensurate with his merits : he has carried the million before him, and, borne onward by the energy which is a part of his fine character, he has so amalgamated all his thoughts and habits with this determination to oppose Popery, that he can rarely either preach of, or talk about, anything else. "*Delenda est Roma,*" is the motto of Mr. McNeile ; and this peculiarity is so well known among those who are in the habit of hearing him, that he is rarely expected to abstain long from his favorite topic. Not long ago he was speaking at a crowded meeting, at Liverpool, on behalf of some charitable institution, but, as usual, he contrived to bring forward, as the staple of his remarks, the abominations of Popery. "Eh, McNeile," exclaimed the shrill voice of an old woman from the end of the room ; "Eh, McNeile, so you be at it again !" This peculiarity must be borne in mind, and the fact that, in Ireland, the Clergy and Dissenters of Protestant denominations join heart and hand against the encroachments of Romanism ; so that Mr. McNeile having been habituated to view Dissent in a far more favourable light than he would have done, had he been born and educated in England, we shall be led to expect a less strenuous defence of the discipline of the Church than of her doctrines—we shall feel no surprise when we find what are usually called "*low-church*" views advocated by this powerful and popular writer.

In the year 1839, a course of lectures was delivered in London, by Dr. Chalmers, on "*Church Establishments ;*" to these Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, replied, and published his reply. In the year 1840, an arrangement was entered into between Mr. Benson and the Committee of the Christian Influence Society, by which that distinguished divine engaged to deliver a course of lectures on the "*Church of England.*" Thus the previous lectures of Dr. Chalmers on Establishments at large, would seem to be confirmed, and concluded, by those of Mr. Benson on the Anglican Church in particular. Now, this course of lectures, from the Master of the Temple, we still hope to hear ; but he was prevented, by indisposition, from delivering them at the time proposed. After some deliberation, whether the intended course should not be altogether postponed till another year, it occurred to the Committee, that a series of lectures on the Church of England, the

character of which should be more *popular* than those at first contemplated, might be productive of much good, and, under these circumstances, their eyes were turned to the Rev. Hugh McNeile.

We cannot pretend to anticipate the line of argument which might have been taken up by Mr. Benson; but we feel inclined to think that it would, in many respects, have differed very materially from that adopted by the present writer. Mr. McNeile, by replying to Dr. Wardlaw, put himself forward as the follower and defender of Chalmers; and, adopting the principles of that eminent man, has completed the argument, and made his course subsidiary to that of the Edinburgh Professor. In so doing, we think, as we have before said, that he acted unadvisedly: it was in his power to have taken much higher ground, and he resembles a commander, who, observing how well a small fort is defended by a small garrison, should insist on defending a large city with a force equally small, when he might command the assistance of an overwhelming array. To defend an Episcopal Church, in which the apostolical succession is preserved, on the same grounds which serve for the defence of a Presbyterian establishment, is, in itself, a great error, and whether it were committed through delicacy to Dr. Chalmers, or from a feeling that it would be *expedient* to take such low ground, we are convinced that it has been injurious. We do not mean that Mr. McNeile has left episcopacy out of the question—he has fairly defended it, and shown it to be in accordance with the Scripture:—

“In our Lord’s address to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, we have the principle of episcopacy established. In his address to seven angels of seven churches in Asia, we have his sanction for the subdivision, the geographical subdivision of episcopal superintendence; and, more than this, we have the foreseen usurpation of a primacy, or universal bishop over the whole Church pointedly condemned. There is an angel over all the pastors in Ephesus—this excludes Independency. There is not an angel over all the pastors in Asia—this excludes Popery.”—Lect. i. p. 42.

In this extract we see quickness of thought, and much point in the mode of expression, together with a marvellously small quantum of logical power, and the whole argument spoiled by Mr. McNeile’s morbid propensity to attack the Pope. The proof is good against Independency; but, inasmuch as it condemns *primacy*, the Church of England is as obnoxious to its conclusions as that of Rome. Let us try the sentence, *à la* McNeile, and suppose that seven churches in England were similarly addressed—all being in the province of Canterbury—

“There is an angel over all the pastors in *Exeter*.”

Granted—though Dissenters and Whig-Radicals are apt to speak of him as by no means a seraphical doctor.

“There is *not* an angel over all the pastors in England.”

So—the primate of all England is not an angel. Well, we are not in the habit of calling him so; though, if ever man merited the title, it is the truly venerable and amiable Dr. Howley. After this, the lecturer takes up the cudgels on behalf of the Kirk, and makes out, completely to his own satisfaction, that the General Assembly is a bishop broken into small pieces—“a collective episcopacy:” a bishopric put into commission and administered like the office of Lord High Admiral or Lord High Treasurer. This, however, is not the kind of argument by which our Anglican episcopacy is to be defended. When Dr. Wiseman attacked the institution, as existing among us, and drew forth Mr. Palmer in reply, we had a grave and solid advocacy of our Church—we had clearly proved to us that her orders are scriptural in their character, apostolical in their derivation, and independent in their jurisdiction: that she had not overstepped her right in refusing obedience to the Bishop of Rome, and in resisting his continual encroachments.

We are willing to allow that Mr. McNeile displays much ingenuity and great occasional eloquence; and, in order to show how ably he disposes of Dr. Wardlaw whenever he is not crippled by the insufficiency of his own postulates, we quote, with pleasure, one of the most luminous *reductiones ad absurdum* which we ever remember to have met with. In Dr. Wardlaw's Lectures, in answer to Chalmers, that advocate of the voluntary system says—

“I grant that Jehovah instituted a National Church; but then he instituted such a Church, with himself as the *supreme head* of *ecclesiastical* and *civil* government in the nation, conducting his administration, in both departments, by a system of supernatural interposition, and immediate manifestation of his presence and authority, such as we mean by a theocracy; the *nation* itself, by this means, sustaining the two-fold character of the *Church* and the *State*: the *Church*, in its relation to Jehovah as its *God*—the *State*, in relation to Jehovah as its *King*. Our question then is—Can this be imitated? Comes it at all within the range of the imitable? Is the conclusion a legitimate one, that, because Jehovah instituted and, of course, approved a national Church *with* such a theocratic superintendence, he must, therefore, be considered as sanctioning the institution of one *without* it?”“So far from the difference being immaterial, it amounts to the difference between human and divine.” “Instead of our being taught the propriety of uniting the Church and State under a human government, may not the legitimate lesson, read to us by the Jewish constitution, be, that under no other circumstances than under God's own immediate

superintendence, is such a union of the civil and the sacred admissible with benefit or with safety?"*

This argument Mr. Mc Neile proves to be worthless, by applying it to the duty of Christian obedience :—

“ Our Lord Jesus Christ obeyed the law of God perfectly ; but it was an obedience of a character so peculiar and unique as to place it beyond the reach of imitation. It was a spotless obedience—a meritorious obedience—an atoning obedience. Our question then is—Can it be imitated? Comes it at all within the range of the imitative? Is the conclusion a legitimate one, that, because a man, *without* original sin, obeyed the divine law, therefore he is to be held up as an example to be followed by a man *with* original sin? Is the difference between the two cases indeed trivial and circumstantial? So far from being immaterial, it amounts to the difference between human and divine. Instead of our being taught the propriety of imitating the obedience of Christ, may not the legitimate lesson, read to us by the obedience of a man in whom there was the union of the *divine nature*, be, that under no other circumstances than such an union can any man obey ?”

This is, indeed, demolition : the favorite refutation of an important theory is shown to prove too much, and the voluntaries are triumphantly ejected from one of their most eligible strong-holds. Throughout the book we meet with many singularly happy exposures of voluntaryism ; and were we to quote all that is well written, we should transcribe more than half of every lecture. But when we arrive at the close, we are made painfully sensible that something has been wanting. The effect wrought is not the effect intended, and we feel inclined to tax the lecturer with lukewarmness in the cause. Now we are well assured that Mr. McNeile is no lukewarm advocate, but an earnest and faithful minister of our Church ; we must, therefore, look elsewhere than to the heart of the lecturer for the causes of this chilling—this deadening effect. It is the adoption of the *expediency* principle—the falling in with the *liberal suggestions* of the day—the Erastian idea of making the Church a mere creature of, and dependency upon, the State. These are the causes which work so disheartening an effect. We speak not of the lecturer's dissatisfaction with some parts of the Liturgy—his wish that the daily service may be so managed, that every individual may leave out what he thinks objectionable—of his desire to abolish the “*cong   d  lire*” of chapters in case of a vacancy in the see, and to making the right of election reside in the Crown. We allude not to his scruples about the absolution to the sick and to the creed of St. Athanasius. All these we shall touch upon in due order, but we speak here of that

* Wardlaw's Lectures, lect. iii. p. 102.

spirit of *secularity*, which would regard the Church in England as a creation of King, Lords, and Commons—which would put that institution of Christ, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, on the same footing with the army or the navy, the police establishment, or the royal academy; differing from the two former only in being more scantily supported, and from the latter only in being made the object of frequent “heavy blows and sore discouragement.”

What is the alliance between Church and State, of which we hear so much? The clergy may well take up the indignant challenge of the men of Judah, and exclaim to those who would fain despoil them of their scanty pittance—“Wherefore, then, be ye angry for this matter? Have we eaten at all of the king’s cost, or hath he given us any gift?” The alliance between Church and State is neither more nor less than this: that in return for the protection afforded to ecclesiastical in common with other property—a protection too frequently withheld—the Church takes upon herself the task of instructing the people in spiritual things. If it be said—But it is the *duty* of the Church to do this, and her indefeasible right; we reply—It is so; and it is the *duty* of the State to protect her property. Now the State has, in many instances, most grossly violated this duty; but the Church has never been found wanting in hers: to the extent of her means, and *beyond* her means, she has promoted and carried on the work of spiritual instruction—she has enlisted in this holy cause both the bounty of the liberal and even the pride of the ostentatious, and but seldom has she received any aid from the State with which she is *allied*.

Again—by what right do the Bishops sit in the House of Lords? is a question frequently put in triumph. Now, this is the *only* concession on the part of the State: viz., that the chief pastors of Christ’s flock shall have a share in the deliberations of the State. But on this topic we enlarged in our last number, and will not here repeat our remarks. But we will observe that Mr. McNeile does not seem clearly to understand this matter, and we will, therefore, venture to set him right. He observes—

“There is a name of election of their bishop continued to the dean and chapter of the diocese, while the impending penalty of a premunire for refusing to choose the nominee of the Crown renders it little more than a name.”—p. 261.

This is represented as one of the causes of that occasional inefficiency observed, or supposed, in the practical working of our Church system:—

“The Church should not be exposed to the sarcasm contained in the *vingt d’élire*, as it now stands; but one of two things should be done,

either the nomination of bishops should belong directly, and at once, to the Crown (as in the case of the Irish Bishops it does), or the statute of Henry VIII., involving a recusant chapter in the extreme penalties of a premunire, should be repealed. In other words, the cathedral clergy should have either a real choice, or a real deliverance from the appearance of a choice."—p. 262.

He then, after expressing his suspicions of "High Churchism," and inferring that the clergy, as a body, are not to be trusted—that if Church discipline were fully carried out—if "Laudism" were to be revived, "None could escape punishment but by submission—both swords would again be wielded by clerical hands."—p. 265. He states—

"It would be a great improvement to abolish the *congé d'élire* altogether, and to give the selection of bishops from amongst the presbyters of the Church *entirely* and absolutely to the Crown."—p. 265.

Now, in this statement, Mr. McNeile is decidedly wrong, and wrong only because he has not paid a sufficient degree of attention to the antiquities of the Church. That the election of a bishop should be in the hands of the chief clergy, is a regulation of very old standing, and it became early the custom to commit such election to the dean and chapter; but since, on the one hand, the Bishops sit in the House of Lords, and have, therefore, no small influence over the affairs of State; and, on the other hand, it would be the giving up of a right, on the part of the clergy, were the election of Bishops to be vested wholly in the Crown, so a compromise has taken place, and the Crown really elects, while the *congé d'élire* acknowledges the ancient right of the chapters—if the Bishops were deprived of their seats in the House of Peers, then the statute of Henry VIII. must be repealed, and what the State gained on the one hand, it would lose on the other. The mischief, however, to the country would be very great; we shall, therefore, proceed to show that the present arrangement is not only founded on principles of justice, but is, in itself, far better than giving to the chapters the right of election.

The political *power* given to the Church, in affairs of State, by the introduction of the bishops into the supreme court of judicature, is compensated by the *influence* given to the Crown in the affairs of the Church, by leaving in the hands of the sovereign the appointment of those very bishops. This is a very equitable arrangement, and one with which both parties are, or ought to be, content; but, inasmuch as the arrangement may not last for ever—and, alas, all the tendencies of our day are towards a debasing democracy—the elective right of the chapters is recognized by the *congé d'élire*, and, doubtless, were the

compact implied violated on the one side, the dormant but unrenounced claims would be put forward and acknowledged on the other. We say doubtless, because we really believe that such would be the case; but, even if not acknowledged, the principle would remain the same; and the Church, by making her claim, would put herself in the position of a just but refused applicant.

But we proceed to show that the present arrangement is expedient as well as right—that the elective power is better exercised by the Crown, than it would, in all probability, be by the chapters. We appeal, in the first place, to experience; we refer to the men raised to the episcopal rank by our present Ministers, and we contend that if *they* have chosen proper persons to be the rulers of the Church—*à fortiori*, would it necessarily be so with *any other possible government in this country*. We take the words of an able contemporary, and declare, “We are neither Whigs nor Radicals, nor, what is worse, Whig-Radicals. We dislike the men that compose our present Administration—we distrust their abilities—we doubt their integrity; morally speaking, we consider them very indifferent—mentally speaking, very mediocre—politically speaking, very ridiculous;” but we are, nevertheless, very well satisfied with the general tenor of their episcopal appointments, and thus we consider that no degree of spiritual indifference—no ill-will towards the Church’s interest on the part of a Whig-Radical Administration—no “heavy blows and sore discouragement to Protestantism,” need cause us to fear the elevation to the mitre of persons *greatly* unfit for the office. Should, however, such an attempt be made, the congé d’élire would be issued in vain, and the recusant chapter would have with them, not the voice of the clergy only, but the voice of the nation at large.

Those who are familiar with the history of the Papacy know well that, insomuch as the conclave of cardinals elect the Pope, each cardinal bishop has a chance that the tiara may fall on his own brows. This causes two inconveniences: first, there is the most unseemly intriguing for the infallible chair, sometimes even proceeding to open violence; and the election, in many cases, has fallen, not on the man most fitted for the station, but on the man whose largesses were the most abundant, or whose promises were the most extensive. Sometimes family interest—sometimes wealth—sometimes engagements by which the interests of the pontificate and the rights of future pontiffs were compromised—prevailed in raising an undistinguished individual to the sovereign see.

But, in addition to this evil, there was a second, still greater

—for under the conclave system, if it were a merit to be rich and powerful, still more was it a merit to be *old*; “Choose an old man, the older the better, and then there will be the sooner a vacancy.” Each disappointed claimant would willingly acquiesce in a choice, which would give him a speedy renewal of his own chance; and, thus, men who were past labour, whose energies were expended, and who were fit only for repose, were placed in a situation, the advantageous filling of which would tax the energies of the most robust, as well as the intellectual power of the most gifted.

Now what has happened, and does happen, in Rome, would, in all probability, happen also in England. If ever it could be shown that there is as much intriguing with Ministers, as there would be with chapters (and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to do this), still there would be no gain by a change in this respect; and we have very little doubt that the episcopal order would be taken from amongst the oldest of the prebendaries, instead of being, as they now are, men sufficiently young to act with energy, and yet sufficiently experienced to act with wisdom. We do not conceive that, in making these remarks, we are bringing any charge against the cathedral clergy, whom we heartily respect; but we do consider that any hints thrown out for an alteration in our present system are ill-judged; and while, on the one hand, we would not deprive *them* of that acknowledgment of their ancient right, implied in the *congé d'élire*, we should be very sorry, on the other hand, to see the *exercise* of that right at present revived.

While thus combating Mr. McNeile's objections, and shewing that his desire for change is injudicious, we must speak also of the form of absolution. This is a more important topic, and the lecturer's errors are, therefore, of more consequence. We shall, then, first give Mr. McNeile's views of absolution. He notices, with a clearness that might have led him to the true solution of his difficulties, the differences between the three absolutions; viz., that in the Morning and Evening Prayer, that in the Communion Service, and that addressed to the Sick; and, after dwelling for a time upon the declaratory character of the two former, he remarks—

“The form in the Visitation of the Sick is more pointed, because it becomes more personal. The minister is no longer dealing in general declarations, to be appropriated or not, according to the various characters of those who hear him. All that belongs to character has been already investigated, as far as man can investigate the mind and heart of his fellow man. The faith and penitence of the sick man have been enquired into and found satisfactory. If not so found, the subsequent

declaration is not to be made—if so found, this naturally divests the subsequent declaration of all that was hypothetical in it when made in the congregation. *There*, he invited to self-examination, by describing the true and indispensable character; *here*, that part of the transaction is already finished, in his personal addresses to the individual, and the answers returned. Here, therefore, the minister has two things ready—God's truth as the donor of forgiveness, and man's prescribed character to be the receiver of forgiveness. All that remains is the exercise of his own office, as the authorized messenger from God to such a man. So situated, he says, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences.' Now, in what sense is *absolve* here used? not, certainly, to convey the idea of bestowing or conferring pardon—that is conveyed by the word *forgive*; and the passage contains a prayer that the Lord may forgive the offender. *Absolve*, then, is here distinguished clearly from *forgive*."—p. 78.

This is, indeed, coming near to the truth, and yet contriving to miss it. Is it possible that Mr. McNeile could so refine upon the meaning of a word so well understood as *absolve*? It signifies, simply to "*release from*;" and to release from sin, is, virtually, the same as to forgive sin—nor will any lexicographer countenance Mr. McNeile's hyper-criticism: but then it must give the priest the power of forgiving sin; and to avoid this acknowledgement, does the lecturer give a new and most erroneous signification to a word, of which every school-boy knows the meaning. But to *absolve*, according to Mr. McNeile, does not signify to release from, but to *declare a release from*; and, if this be the case, to *give*, by analogy, must signify not to make a donation, but merely to announce one—and to *preach*, not to deliver a sermon, but merely to announce it: consequently, when Mr. McNeile preaches a charity sermon on behalf of some Anti-Popish Society, it is not Mr. McNeile who preaches, but the parish clerk who on the previous Sunday gives notice of the intended discourse.

"And when the minister proceeds to say, 'and by his authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins,' the intended meaning is not *I forgive*, but I declare and pronounce to you—I, God's messenger, entrusted with this truth, declare and pronounce to you, A. B., a penitent believer, the forgiveness of all your sins."—p. 79.

After this, the lecturer is bound to say what he candidly does say—that he believes the expression to be—

"An unwise oversight in the purifiers of the Book of Prayer, inconsistent with our other services, and needlessly prejudicial in wounding the consciences of weak brethren, and multiplying disaffection in various degrees against our Church."—*Ibid*.

In all this it is easy to see that Mr. McNeile is not satisfied,

as, indeed, how can he be, with his own explanation?—That he considers the absolution to the sick as a remnant of Popery, and one which ought to be immediately stripped away from the Reformed Church. He is a man of eminence—a man of talent—a man of Christian candour and courtesy, and we would wish to speak of him with respect; but we cannot help asking him if he ever read *any* treatise on Ecclesiastical Antiquity—*any* treatise upon Absolution—nay, even *any* commentary upon the Book of Common Prayer? We would not insist upon Palmer and Bingham, but Wheatley and Mant are within the reach of any clergyman. Why did not Mr. McNeile read some *one* of these authors, before he came forward to condemn our incomparable Liturgy? Let us now, out of the above-mentioned writers, explain to Mr. McNeile the Church's theory of absolution, and show him that she uses words in their true sense, while she allows not her priesthood to usurp the Divine prerogatives,

Every open sin committed by a man making profession of Christianity is triplex in its character; it is an offence against God—an offence against society—and an offence against *the Church*. It is an offence against God, for his holy law is violated; it is an offence against society, for its regulations are broken through; and it is an offence against the Church, because a disgrace is brought against the Christian name. So fully is this last position understood, that, in all ages, public acknowledgment has been required by the Church, and that, not only when the Church was apostolically constituted, but even when Presbyterianism or Independency had taken the place of Episcopacy. Penance is required in the Kirk of Scotland, in the Establishment of Geneva, and—even in the Independent congregations of our day, “a brother who walks disorderly,” or who avows heretical opinions, is excommunicated.

Having premised thus much, we shall illustrate our statement by taking an instance—that of fraudulent gain—the party guilty has, evidently, offended God, his neighbour, and the Church. He may obtain forgiveness of God on repentance—from his neighbour on restitution (we put the law of man out of the question here, as it is but the generalized expression of “our neighbour”)—but how shall he obtain forgiveness of the Church? She, if her discipline be strictly carried out, has forbidden him to approach her altars—has cut him off from her communion, and this she has done by the voice of her priest, speaking her laws and in her name. He must, then, acknowledge his guilt and request forgiveness, and *then* the priest, again acting as the organ of the Church, declares, if he believes the

penitence sincere, "I absolve thee from all thy sins." This is a plain, absolute, and unconditional declaration—"By his (that is Christ's) authority, committed unto me, I absolve thee." Now that our Church neither does, nor ever did, consider this to be a mere declaration of God's pardon, is evident from two circumstances: first, because she *subsequently* requires the penitent to pray that God would "not impute unto him his former sins:" but if the form of absolution implied that God *had* forgiven them, why should the succeeding prayer—dictated by a truly humble and contrite spirit, and the whole tenor of which is to implore the Divine forgiveness—be offered at all? It would be absurd to pray for pardon after the pardon had been declared. But, no—the framers of our Liturgy meant no such absurdity: they directed the priest to absolve—that is, to forgive, absolutely; so far as the Church was concerned, to remove any ecclesiastical censure, if such had been incurred, and to dispense with them if they *would have been* incurred (for *this* absolution only takes place after confession, and not then, unless humbly and heartily desired). Then, after having been *absolutely forgiven*, on behalf of the Church, the penitent is again led to address the Almighty, in order that the *moral* and *spiritual* guilt may be forgiven.

But there is another reason which supports our view of the case, and it is—that a *priest* is required to read this or any other absolution; and a deacon is not permitted to do so. Now a *layman* has authority to declare, to all within hearing of him, that God's mercy will be extended to the truly penitent: but he has no authority to forgive, on the part of the Church, those who have offended against the Church; and, consequently, the very requirement of a priest to pronounce it, shows that it is something more than a mere declaration: in fact, that it means what it says. This too will explain, and explain satisfactorily, what has very much puzzled Mr. McNeile, and hundreds beside him—viz., those words in the Ordination Service, addressed by the bishop to the priest, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost for the work of a priest in the Church of God; whose soever sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose soever sins thou dost retain, they are retained!" This is the dread commission, the exercise of which we have seen in the visitation office—both perfectly intelligible when viewed in the light of antiquity, both monstrous and blasphemous, in the highest degree, if understood as Mr. McNeile would explain them.

But herein lies the difficulty to him and to all amenders of our Liturgy; they view it in connection with our present ecclesias-

tical condition, and, perceiving the discrepancies between them, forget that our formularies are adapted to a strict and godly discipline, and that it is our duty not to lower the forms of the Church to the cold and lax standard of modern expediency, but to raise our practice to the warmth and self-devotedness required by the Church. Well did the Archbishop of Canterbury observe, when a petition was presented, praying that the rubrics might be altered to be conformable to the practice of the clergy.—“that *if there were any discrepancy*, the practice of the clergy must be altered and made conformable to the rubrics.” We have one or two more remarks as to our three absolutions, which we must make before we quit the subject. The first is merely a declaration that God “pardoneth and absolveth all those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel”—and goes on to pray for repentance. This is read in the full congregation, where, from the very nature of the case, no other form can be used, and many wicked, impenitent persons, and many absolutely excommunicate, may be present. The second is used at the administration of the Holy Eucharist, and, inasmuch as no excommunicate persons are present, and it is charitably presumed that *all* come in the fear of God, the declaration is changed into a prayer. Now, in these two forms, the forgiveness referred to is the forgiveness of God, not the forgiveness of the Church; because the last, in the former case, could not reasonably be conferred—in the latter case it is not needed—whereas, in the form for the Visitation of the Sick, it is both needed and conferred.

This is perfectly reasonable: if a child behaved himself undutifully towards his parent, we should desire him to seek forgiveness, not of God only, but of his parent also: and, if that parent refused to grant forgiveness, we should not suppose that *we* had authority to confer it in his name, unless the parent commissioned us so to do. It is true that the priest may refuse his absolution, but the penitent has done his duty in seeking it, and, *if honest*, is thereby absolved “*in foro conscientie*,” just as the child who has behaved undutifully can do no more than express his sorrow for the past, and his determination to amend for the future.

The Funeral Service, too, was intended only for communicants; but excommunication is now a mere *brutum fulmen*, and nine-tenths of our vast population are in a state of practical excommunication. We know very well that the framers of that sublime service contemplated everlasting happiness by the term “Resurrection to eternal life;” though, alas! in too many

cases, the clergy of our day are obliged to satisfy their consciences by taking it only in its bare literal sense.

We have entered into these questions at some length—the reader who is curious as to earlier usages, may consult, with advantage, Bingham, book xviii., chap. 4., and book xix., chap. 1, 2, 3, of his “*Origines Ecclesiasticæ*.” We have, we say, entered at considerable length into these questions, because we are both grieved and disappointed at finding Mr. McNeile so ill informed. We have reason to believe that his attainments are rather greater than less than those which may be taken as the average of clerical learning, and we, therefore, cordially agree with him when he says—

“Another cause of comparatively limited efficiency in our Church will be found in the want of adequate training in candidates for the ministry: a collegiate education, as commonly conducted, is not enough.”—p. 249.

There is Greek enough, and Latin enough, and Mathematics more than enough, but there is not a sufficient amount of Ecclesiastical History and Ecclesiastical Antiquities studied. Were a professorship of these combined branches of learning established in each of our universities, and candidates for orders permitted to attend lectures (for no compulsion would be needed), there is scarcely any computing how much good would be effected. A few thousands of pounds subscribed and thus expended, would do more for our Church, in the present crisis, than ten times the amount employed in *any other way*. But an examination should be required as well as a mere attendance, and the Professor should be a man at once learned and moderate, sound, sincere, and pious—in fine, an EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMAN. We conclude our remarks on Mr. McNeile’s lectures, by quoting an admirable passage:—

“The city of God was supplied with a number of watches, all set a-going, and set right, but not absolutely and infallibly secured against going wrong: had this been all, the consequences had been dangerous in the extreme. The watches might go wrong, and so gradually and imperceptibly, so universally, as to attract no special attention, till day was turned into night. But this was *not* all—before the watches had time to go seriously wrong, a sun-dial was set up, giving unalterably the true time, and of course supplying a rectifying standard with which to compare, and by which to re-set the fallible watches. The dial alone, without the watches, would have been inconvenient, multitudes not knowing how to consult it; and the watches alone, without the dial, would have been dangerous and delusive, for the reasons already assigned; but in the combination of both, the Church has all the con-

venient readiness of the watch, together with all the satisfying certainty of the dial."—p. 81.

We have now closed our remarks upon Mr. McNeile, and turn to a book of a much higher character. The "Standard of Catholicity" proves that Dr. Biber has been thinking much and deeply on the important subject he has chosen: there is a gravity, a honesty about his work, which wins the confidence of the reader; and yet we find ourselves somewhat similarly affected at the close, as by the lectures of Mr. McNeile. The cause is, however, different—the one, brilliant and too often sophistical, cuts the Gordian knot of any difficulties, and plunges us into error—the other, slow, but cautious, leaves us in doubt; the one hurries us over the precipice—the other shows us the gulf, and stays us on the edge. What we want is the sure guide who will point out the *stepping-stones*, who will lead us through the gloom till our eyes become inured to it, and bring us safely out on the other side; the gulf is not impassable, though neither a desperate rush, nor yet a dead halt, will carry us over it.

We must analyze Dr. Biber's work—which, insufficient as it is, is nevertheless a great work—and trace his progress through the argument he takes up. After a very able introduction, he proceeds to show that Christianity is inseparable from the voice of the Spirit, and that as the salvation of men is decreed by God, "that we should be to the praise of his glory," so it is mere folly to attempt to separate ourselves from the mass of our brethren, and imagine that our individual renovation is all the Spirit has to do with us. In this the Doctor agrees with Isaac Taylor, who, in the very first number of his "Ancient Christianity," says—

"The eager, forward-looking temper of these stirring times, has withdrawn Christians far too much from the quieting recollection that they are themselves members of a series, and portions of a mass; nor do we so much or so often as might be, well entertain the solemn meditation, that we individually are hastening to join the general assembly of those who, from age to age, have stood where we now stand as the holders and professors of God's truth in the world."—*Ancient Christianity*, p. 41.

But the inference deduced from this acknowledged fact by Dr. Biber is a far more sound and wholesome one than that derived from it by Mr. Taylor. For, whereas the latter recommends us to associate ourselves with those who have gone before only in order to expose their weakness and convict them of dangerous error, the former would lead us to consider the voice of the Spirit as a covenant grace, promised only to those

who fulfil the conditions of the covenant—viz., union with the Church Catholic.

“The difficulty of the task does not render it less obligatory, any more than the number and plausible character of those who have fallen into error and sin can ever convert their error into truth, or their sin into righteousness. Let not, then, such questions be asked as the following: ‘What! shall we refuse the name of Christians to large bodies of men, many of whom are distinguished by learning, piety, and self-denying consistency of character? shall we contract the Church within the narrow limits of one particular system of doctrine and discipline, however deservedly distinguished? shall we disown and cast overboard those, who while they differ from us in some points under the influence of ‘conscientious scruples,’ yet nevertheless join with us in the profession of Christ’s holy name, in the acknowledgment of the Scriptures as the standard of truth, and in the hope of salvation through the blood of Christ?’ To all such questions there is but one answer—‘Let God be true and every man a liar.’ The questions which we must ask, if we would honour the truth of God rather than the waywardness of men, are of a different description altogether. What is the meaning of the term ‘Church of God?’ Is membership of that Church the inherent right of every man, or is it dependent upon a Divine appointment? And if the latter, what are the terms upon which, the forms through which, that appointment is first made and afterwards maintained? Such are the questions which we must try, and in order satisfactorily to try them, we must enter upon the enquiry without reference to the existing, and possibly corrupt state of things, regardless of the conclusions to which a consistent application of the fundamental principles upon which we have to fall back may ultimately lead. If error has prevailed, it is to be expected that the greater the error, and the greater its prevalence, the more mortifying must be the result of an unflinching recurrence to the truth, but that is no reason for keeping the truth for ever out of sight.”—p. 72-74.

He goes on to prove that membership of the Church is a covenant state; that Christianity is a trust committed to the Church; that the document of the Church’s trust is Divinely, not humanly, authenticated; that it is complete and sufficient for its purpose; that the authority of the Church is ministerial to her trust; that she is responsible throughout all her generations and in all her branches; and he concludes with some admirable observations on the privilege and duty of the Anglican Church.

We have remarked that an impression of incompleteness was left upon our minds by the perusal of this book, and we could wish that its author, whose candid and powerful mind well fits him for his task, would, after a few years, revise it, and what is now deficient will, we are assured, be *then* supplied. At present, he appears like a man who stops short because he knows

not whither the path he takes will lead him. His views are rarely incorrect, but often misty; and on the authority of the Church, while he takes high ground, he is evidently afraid to defend his own position. This can only arise from having erroneously considered his position: it is the error into which the writers of the "Tracts for the Times" have fallen; and the difference between them and Dr. Biber in their treatment of this point is, that *they*, afraid to speak out, have *hinted* the conclusions to which their premises led, while *he* has "foreclosed" the whole in a mysterious darkness. We *know* the Tracts are wrong; we *think* Dr. Biber is wrong, though he has not spoken out plainly enough for us to be *certain*. We think that the perusal of this article will throw a light upon the commission of the Church, which he will find confirmed by our older and sounder divines.

But we are thankful to see so good a book—a book written in a spirit so courteous, so conciliating, so truly Christian; and, were it only for the remarks on Tradition, we should think that Dr. Biber had done the Church a service.

"The first question that presents itself is naturally this—whether the Apostles of our Lord, and their fellow-writers of the Canonical New Testament, wrote with a view to secure by their writings the permanency of their doctrine—whether, consequently, the canon of the New Testament may be looked upon as a complete body of apostolic doctrine, intentionally compiled as such under the direction of the Holy Spirit?

"The next question, supposing the New Testament Scriptures to be recognized as a body of apostolic doctrine, purposely, that is, by purpose of inspiration, so compiled, appears to be this—whether this body of apostolic doctrine be so comprehensive and so explicit, as to define in so many words, fully and accurately, every point of faith and practice in the Christian Church?"

Now, if the first of these questions be answered in the affirmative, and the second in the negative, there will remain a further question—whether the deficiency, or apparent deficiency, was to be supplied by an "oral tradition," or whether these things were left undetermined, some to preserve in the Church a constant sense of dependence on her Divine head, and others because the social institutions of various ages and countries might be better adapted to them if the Church had an accommodating power? These are important questions, and ought not to be overlooked; but, after all, there is no computing the volumes that might be written on the subject of Tradition, if the writers, as disputants generally do, give us no clear definition as to what is meant by "Apostolical Tradition." We should really

thank the writers of the Tracts if they would give us one to define this term; one which would enable us to understand what they mean when they say, "Scripture and Tradition together are the joint rule of Faith."—*Tracts for the Times*, No. 78, Prefatory Remarks.

But to proceed with Dr. Biber's argument: he observes, that as the beautiful system of Nature is widely different from the *system* which Science makes out of Nature's apparent confusion, the great system of *theology*, as revealed in Scripture, is a very different thing from the system of *theologians*.

In fact, "that the whole body of truth so set forth, is nowhere summed up, arranged, or comprehended in a systematic statement, but must, from first to last, be gathered from the seemingly fragmentary intimations of it which are scattered throughout the whole course of God's dealings with man."

Now, since the written Gospel and Tradition teach by an entirely different method, inasmuch as the latter is *always*, the former *never*, systematic, there are two suppositions only left for us—viz., that the New Testament Scriptures were superadded over and above the original gift of tradition, or that they were written to convey to future ages that which *could not safely* be done by tradition: the former is the ground taken up by the Tracts, the latter by Dr. Biber, who follows the *Reformers*. Primitive tradition has, nevertheless, no small value in our eyes; we look upon it as giving a weight to many things otherwise non-essential; and we would deem him but ill qualified, either by feeling or attainment, to minister in holy things, who looked with indifference upon the modes of worship, the forms of prayer, used by those "ancient men" who had heard the discourses of the apostles, or, perhaps, beheld in the flesh "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."

The right of the Church to "decree ceremonies" is well maintained in the "Standard of Catholicity;" and this brings us to notice the petition presented in the House of Lords, by the Archbishop of Dublin, and to which we have in a former number referred. It was to pray for an alteration in the Liturgy. Such petitions have not been frequent, but they have occasionally occurred: and since that period a pamphlet has been published by two brothers, named Hull, one a layman and one a clergyman; which pamphlet gives a history of two similar petitions—one presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and signed by ten clergymen; another to the Bishop of Chester, signed by nine clergymen; and lastly, one to the House of Lords, signed by sixty persons, thirty of whom were laymen. Now, on this multiform petition (for it seems that the eighteen

clergymen whose names appeared in the first two, appeared also in the third)—on this multiform petition we mean to offer a few remarks. The anecdote of three tailors in Tooley Street, who sent up a petition to Sir Robert Peel, beginning “We, the British Nation,” is well known; and some of our readers may remember to have heard of a Scotch clergyman, whose parish consisted of two small islands in the Clyde, and who, in an extemporaneous prayer, having besought every blessing, spiritual and temporal, upon “the greater and the lesser Cromlech,” piously added a supplication that the Almighty would not “entirely overlook the *adjacent islands* of Great Britain and Ireland.” Somewhat similar is, we conceive, the fact of *thirty* clergymen having presented the petition in question; but with regard to the prayer of the petition itself, there is an apparent reason for it in the evident discrepancy between our existing ritual and our existing discipline.

The Burial Service, for instance, is not calculated for the persons over whom, alas! it is often read. And what can be done here? Is the most sublime of human compositions—the most spiritual in its tenor, the most adapted for the consoling of the survivor, the most correct with regard to the departed pious—to be mangled and curtailed, and made to suit the drunkard, the libertine, or the prostitute? Such a proceeding could not be contemplated without horror. Is it, then, according to Mr. McNeile’s plan, to be intersected with brackets, which would disgust the survivors, and bring, necessarily, a personal obloquy upon the officiating minister? Surely not. Must it then be profaned, as it now daily is, by being read over the self-excommunicated reprobate, till both priest and people come to think it merely a matter of form? We think this might be avoided: but the means could only be afforded by convocation. Our plan would be, to insist on the form as it stands in our prayer-book being confined to *communicants*; communicants in their *own church*, or to such as should at least have communicated before death. For others a *new form* might be prepared—one which, while it consisted simply of prayers for the survivors and the Church, and recognized the hand of God in the death of every man, should yet avoid compromising either the authority of the Church or the conscience of the clergyman.

The political dissenter is, to a certain extent, answered by Mr. McNeile; the religious dissenter by Dr. Biber: but there are a large class of persons who, though not in union with the Church, do, nevertheless, repudiate the title Dissenter. What shall be said to these? We allude to the Wesleyan Methodists, who have been for a long time in a very anomalous position. In

order to understand this, we must take a brief glance at the constitution of the Wesleyan body—a body of which we think highly, and shall speak in terms of respect. We have had frequent occasion to refer to that lamentable period of lethargy, when our Anglican Church was confessedly inefficient; and we have seen how the regular and irregular revivers of religion, by bringing the doctrines of the Gospel before the minds of the people, worked gradually a great, and, we trust, still progressive change. Among these revivers were the two Wesleys, men of note and learning, who organized a spiritual society, to be subsidiary to the Church: they instituted meetings for prayer, meetings for exhortation, meetings for mutual edification; all, however, at *uncanonical hours*, that the members of his societies might regularly attend the service at their own parish church. Such was the idea, and such was the practice of that great and venerable man, John Wesley. And though we pretend not to justify his irregularities, we would yet remind our readers that he lived in a period of peculiar spiritual need, and that he was *never* under any, even the slightest, ecclesiastical censure. In the year 1756, he published “Twelve unanswerable reasons for not quitting the National Establishment.”

“It is a remarkable coincidence, and one not generally known to Dissenters themselves, that the Puritans and Nonconformists, when they first separated from the Church, exhorted their followers still to receive ‘the sacrament’ at the church.”—*Dr. Burton*, p. 15.

Wesley, when he partially withdrew his prohibition of services at canonical hours, still adhered to the necessity and duty of receiving the Eucharist from ministers episcopally ordained; and on this he insisted even to the day of his death. The work of Dr. Burton, “The Church and Dissent,” is, though addressed to schismatics at large, more peculiarly adapted for Methodists. He was himself at one time a Wesleyan minister, and has still two brothers, his seniors, engaged in the same work among that sect; he has, consequently, had better opportunities for observing its progress and character; and in this little tract (for it is no more), does he give so good a reason for the change in his own views, argue so gently yet so forcibly with sectarians, and place in so strong a light the duty of upholding the Church, that we can most cordially recommend his work for distribution.

The Wesleyan discipline is worth studying as a master-piece of policy; and, ecclesiastically speaking, it stands on a widely different basis from that of Independency. It has the same authority for the validity of its orders as Presbyterianism; and, though in practice it is marked by some strange anomalies, its ministers are, nevertheless, well aware where the strength of

their position lies. The affairs of the whole body, temporal and spiritual, are governed by an assembly called the Conference, and which occupies the same place as the General Assembly in the Church of Scotland; differing only in this, that it has the exclusive power of ordaining. This body is composed, by the constitution of the society, of one hundred senior preachers; but, practically, of all those ministers who are "admitted to full connexion," and who choose to attend. It is held in rotation in the metropolis, at Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Leeds, Birmingham, and Sheffield. To the Conference belong the stationing of preachers, and the management of what are called circuits: these are districts, into which the whole kingdom is divided; and there are for the most part two preachers stationed in each—one called superintendent, who acts as rector, and one assistant, who acts as curate. The country is again divided into "districts," each district comprising a certain number of circuits, and presided over by a chairman, who acts as archdeacon, and these are all ruled by a Conference, which, like the General Assembly, according to Mr. McNeile, is a "collective episcopacy." The Church prayers are read in the Wesleyan meeting-houses, or, at least, it is deemed by all allowable, and by many orthodox, that they should be read: the ministers agree to the doctrinal articles of the Church, and trace a spiritual descent from lawfully ordained presbyters of the Anglican Establishment; this they consider to give them a right to the title of Churchmen. But we must now reverse the picture.

The Wesleyans, being sound in *doctrine*, willingly fraternize with members of the Church, who hold very low views in point of discipline. Once acknowledge that adherence to any Church is a matter of choice—that all have the same right—that the Independent, the Baptist, the Wesleyan, the Presbyterian, and the Episcopalian, all stand on the same platform—and that, if they are free from Popery and Socinianism, everything else is a mere variety of opinion—that the apostolical succession is a not very cunningly devised fable—that the authority of the Church is a nullity, and her visibility a fiction—once agree to all this, and the Wesleyans will heartily join us, and congratulate us on our *freedom from bigotry*, our *liberal spirit*, and our *Catholic charity*. In Dr. Burton's little work he earnestly contends for the "faith once delivered to the saints," for the "form of sound words" handed down to us from the æra of the apostles, and most anxiously would we recommend it to that important body, to whose attention it is chiefly directed.

We conclude with a passage from Dr. Biber, which should be written in letters of gold.—p. 207-8.

"The Church has no right, from a fear of the inconvenience and perplexity to which such a connexion may subject her, to withhold her services (if sought) from the State, seeing that the administration of any trust, the exercise of any authority in the State by the Church and those who have authority, in the Church, cannot be otherwise than of advantage to the State; neither has the Church a right to throw up such trust lightly, if once undertaken. But, on the other hand, the Church must not lose sight of her superior responsibility to Christ himself for a higher trust; and, rather than compromise the principles involved in *that* trust, she must be prepared to resign again, if called upon to do so by the State, the *temporal* trust which she has undertaken, or to suffer persecution for righteousness sake.

"For her own sake, the Church has nothing more to do than to be faithful to her divine commission, and ready to comply with any requirements the world may make upon her, as long as these are compatible with the allegiance she owes to Christ. For the sake of the world, whom she is called upon to benefit by whatever authority she possesses, she is to hold on, to the utmost limits of endurance, any trust she has undertaken.

"If, in any State which has committed to the Church authority, as is the case with ourselves, co-extensive with the boundaries of its own power, the enemies of the truth should so far prevail as to drive the Church from the position once assigned, and to despoil her of the authority once committed to her—not the Church, but the State, will be the loser. If (which in the present aspect of the times seems not improbable) Romanism, Dissent, Infidelity, and that worst of truth's enemies, the pseudo liberality of Indifferentism, should, by their unnaturally united efforts, succeed in unnationalizing the Anglican Church, or rather in unchristianizing the nation, the Church will still prosper, even through the most fiery trials which her oppressors may prepare for her; *but the British Empire, the fairest of earth's kingdoms, will infallibly and irretrievably be laid in the dust.*

"The kingdom that has taken Christ into its councils, by the incorporation of his body into the constitution of the State, can never cast him off, without experiencing the truth of that fearful saying, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay *saith the Lord.*'"

ART. II.—*Aristophanis, opera omnia.* F. H. BOTHE. Lipsiæ. 1828.

2. *The Birds of Aristophanes.* BY J. W. SUVERN. Translated by W. R. HAMILTON, F.R.S. London: Murray. 1835.

"IT has been somewhere remarked by Lord Byron (says Mr. Mitchell), that of the ancient Greeks we already know more than enough." The extent of our knowledge at that time, and the competency of the noble lord to form an opinion on such a subject, admit of considerable question, when we compare the once famous works of Potter and Robinson with the

elaborate treatises of Boëckh, Müller, Stüvern, and Wachsmuth. Few ancient authors have been more indebted to the learning and activity of these moderns than Aristophanes; and this because the language of comedy being that of familiar dialogue and colloquial wit (a language in a very high degree idiomatic, as well in its terms and phrases as in its construction), an intimate acquaintance with the domestic habits and familiar phraseology of a nation, is indispensable to a right understanding of its comic drama. The learning and research of modern archæologists, their deep and accurate investigations into these subjects, have mainly tended to rescue the comic drama of that country from long, though undeserved, neglect. The comedies of Aristophanes, for years cast into the shade, either as unintelligible, or if intelligible, as immoral, have been of late raised from their unmerited abasement, and regarded not as mere exercise grounds for the ingenuity of critics, but rather as well stored mines of information as to the public and private habits of the most refined, most fickle, and most energetic nation of old Greece.

The comic drama of the age of Cleon and Alcibiades was nearer allied to the press of the nineteenth century* than to its modern namesake. An allusion, a satiric jest, a bitter reproof, was received with laughter and applause when uttered by the masked actor; in the ecclesia, confiscation or death would have been the satirist's reward. Even the mighty Demus, the lord of the Pnyx, cheered his own caricature within the walls of the comic theatre. The opposition, the Athenian conservatives, the peace party, when defeated in the ecclesia, took refuge on the comic stage.

It is not only as a mere dramatist, therefore, that we should regard Aristophanes; but as the representative of that sober-minded party in Athens, who, far from being dazzled with the glittering triumphs of war, foresaw eminent danger from that pandering to, and encouragement of, the people, so heedlessly practised during periods of excitement by the leaders of the

* The gentleman who "does" the ancient dramatic biography for the "Penny Cyclopædia" seems to doubt the power of the old comic drama as the prototype of the press, but would rather refer that power to the demagogues of the ecclesia. He seems to doubt the possibility of a sufficient number of persons being present at the representation. The number of free citizens, however, was never more than 40,000; and these were the only persons necessary to be influenced so as to alter the votes in the ecclesia. One fourth, at least, of these citizens, if not more, might be accommodated, and were generally present, in the great theatre—a tolerable circulation for a newspaper in those days.

anti-Laconian or war party. The seniors among them had seen how the lowest classes of the people had gradually been creeping into power since the fight for freedom at Salamis, where the meanest Athenian earned the gratitude of Greece;* and they could not close their eyes to the alarming fact, that, year by year, as the war crept on, legislative power was becoming more firmly fixed in the hands of the lowest of the populace. The continuance of the war was essential to the success of the democratic party—to the existence of the demagogues—to the elevating the mercantile above the agricultural interests. “It was a war, (eloquently remarks Mr. Mitchell),† not merely between Greek and Greek, but a war of all opposite and contending principles, of Dorians against Ionians, in every possible contrast of manners, habits, blood, and religious faith; it was the maintenance of ancient custom as opposed to the desire of novelty; it was aristocracy against democracy, and the combination of free Greeks against the evil ambition of one State.” The one party depended upon the contingents of their neighbouring allies, the other on the forced contributions of their dependents. The one party relied on their land forces, the majority of whom were free citizens, educated, well-born, and noble; the other on their numerous Triremes, where, save the few Hoplites who were embarked and the officers, all were low—the lowest dregs of the port of the Piræus. It was faith opposed to force, blood against muscle. Every successive year of war disclosed to the “bench-tied”‡ populace their increased value; and they rose proportionably in their demands. Fearful of being driven from office, the ministry of the day gave in, year after year, to their clamour, until at last came on that universal plethocracy which subverted Athens and her constitution.

So late as the sixth year of the war, a motion for peace would have been drowned in the ecclesia. It was through the medium of the stage alone that the anti-war party could hope to lead the minds of the excited people to the desired end. Five years of invasion, rapine, plague, and death, had passed over the devoted city, and still the cry arose “let the war go on.”§ The sixth|| year broke the solemn silence, and, as far as

* Aristotle tells us in his politics, that the exertions of the dregs of the populace, in the sea fights against the Persians, gained them that very sudden ascendancy which eventually overthrew their country.

† Introduction to Acharnians. ‡ ‘ο θρανίτης λεῶς. Acharnians.

§ ‘ο πολέμος ἐρπέτω. Thuc. lib. ii.

|| It may have been earlier; but from the loss of the Dætales and Babylonians we cannot affix an earlier date with any degree of certainty.

we can judge, the author of the "Acharnians" first raised the cry of Peace ! Peace ! This note once sounded, its fearless utterer ceased not to deride and ridicule the successes of the war party ; to depict the baneful effects of each successive campaign on Athens and her resources, and to solicit, again and again, amnesty, truce, and peace, with their co-adjutors in the great work of liberating Greece.

These political exhortations, allusions, and caricaturings, we believe, are to be clearly traced in "The Acharnians," "The Knights," "The Peace," and "The Birds," of Aristophanes. That reconciliation with Sparta, and the lessening the power of Cleon, were the aim and end of the three first will be readily conceded ; but when we claim for the last a definite political aim and purpose, we are bound to make good our position against one who holds the first of places among dramatic critics—the learned Schlegel, by whom the charge of purposelessness is not confined to this or that play ; but is brought against the whole comic drama of Greece, "*ab ovo usque ad mala*." "In modern comedy* (says Schlegel), the form of representation is itself earnest, that is, regularly tied down to a fixed and certain purpose. In the old comedy, on the contrary, it is mirthful—a seeming purposelessness and arbitrary caprice seems to prevail throughout ; the entire poem is one great jest." Finding this dictum rather inconsistent with his own views of such of the plays of our author as are generally called the political, such as the "Acharnians," "Knights" and "Peace," the Professor lays down another law to meet the case, when he adds—"The work certainly may, nay must have a main object ; but that the comic spirit may not evaporate, this same object must be turned into sport, and the impression must be done away with by foreign admixtures of every kind." It is hardly worth while to delay long on this latter dictum, when we consider the almost entire absence of strictly adventitious matter in the comedies before mentioned ; but let us rather pass on to those plays which seem to be amenable to the first dictum of censure, the utterly purposeless plays, the "Birds" and "Wasps" of our author. Against these dramas the especial bolts of the Schlegelian school have been launched ; the latter of the two has been defended with the usual success by Mr. Mitchell. May we be half as successful in our defence of the former.

"The Birds of Aristophanes† (says Schlegel), sparkle with the boldest and richest imagination in the province of the fan-

* Lectures on Dramatic Literature, Part I.

† Lectures on Dramatic Literature, Part i. page 311.

tastically marvellous; it is a merry, buoyant creation, bright with the gayest plumage." "I cannot agree (continues the Professor) with the ancient critic who conceives the main portion of the work to consist in the most universal and unreserved satire on the corruptions of the Athenian State, nay, of all constitutions in general: say, rather, it is a *piece of harmless buffoonery*, which has a touch at everything, gods as well as men, but without anywhere pressing to any particular object." This dictum passed as good law until the year 1827, when another of the professors of that professor-ridden land, rushed to the defence of "The Birds," raised his scheme in opposition to the Schlegelian, and volunteered to prove this piece of *harmless buffoonery* to be nothing less than the "most ingenious and elaborate of the political comedies of Aristophanes." Its chief aim, according to that learned doctor, was to ridicule the preposterous expectations entertained by the Athenians as to the consequences of the too famous Sicilian expedition, if (as they had determined it should be) successful. Its collateral object was to exhibit to the public eye a view of the extreme corruption, perversity, and vanity of Athenian life and manners; particularly the licentiousness of the demagogue, and the culpable ease with which the people, from their being ever intent on the extension of their dominion, allowed themselves to be carried away to new and adventurous schemes by the fallacious reasoning of the orators of the ecclesia. In this drama the matter is so delicately interwoven with its poetical dress, that we must not be surprised if the thread by which the meaning of its airy tissue is to be unravelled should have escaped the observation of so many of the commentators. The success of the last attempt we must now consider.

According to the fable, two Athenians, Peisthetairos and Euelpides, disgusted with the vices and follies of their countrymen, set out in search of some fair terra incognita, and under the pilotage of a jackdaw and a crow, arrive at Birdland, in order to obtain from the omni-volant king some information as to a snug, out-of-the-way berth. Epops, the late King of Thrace, and now the triple-crested King of Birdland, being unable to satisfy these fastidious adventurers, the principal Athenian, Peisthetairos, proposes to the king a wondrous joint-stock scheme, whereby the birds may, with the help of men, be reinstated in their ancient sovereignty which they held before the creation of Jupiter, and the other new comers, at Olympus. "Build," he says, "a vast ornitho-anthropo-metropolis in mid-air, intercept the odour of the sacrifices on their way from earth to heaven, and starve these new gods into resigning their usurped

dominions to its ancient possessors." Epops, overjoyed at the grand idea, first calls up his wife to his councils, and then proceeds to summon* a full ecclesia of his subjects. In they pour

* When we were schoolboys, we remember being led towards our author by some very neat translations of parts of this play, executed by a fellow-scholar, now a most diligent labourer in the Church. Without interrupting the story, we will subjoin some of the most elegant of his labours.

To begin with the ode by which Epops calls his ecclesia :—

 "Hoopoe, popo, popoo, popoo,
 Come, come, come, come, come.
 Come hither, come hither, ye birds of the air,
 Ye who feed on the mountain, or feed on the plain,
 Ye who pick up the seeds, or devour the full grain,
 Hither, oh ! quickly, come hither repair :
 And still, while your hitherward course ye wing,
 Evermore merrily whistle and sing.
 All ye on the greensward who hop or who sit,
 Who chirp in the furrows and merrily twit,
 Ye who perch in the orchard mid ivied shades,
 Ye who wing o'er the meadows and skim o'er the glades,
 Ye who peck at the arbute or olive tree,
 Fly ye hither, oh ! fly ye to me ;
 Whistle and sing,
 'Till the wide woods ring ;
 Twitter twit, twitter twit, twit, twit, twit."

One more, the generation of the birds from the Parabasis :—

"All was chaos and dark night—nor earth, nor air, nor light—
 And Tartarus just then could repose him,
 When night, the dark-wing'd shade, a monstrous wind egg laid,
 And dropp'd it clean in Erebus's bosom ;
 And lovely Eros then, in months some time or ten,
 Cracked his egg-shell with golden pinion ;
 So glittering off he past, swift as the echoing blast,
 When the wind o'er heav'n holds dominion.
 Dusky chaos then he kiss'd, amid Tartarus' black mist,
 And our race was the fruit of their marriage.
 Thus of elder birth are we, than heaven, or earth, or sea ;
 And our people who dares to disparage ?
 The gods themselves must yield, vanquished must quit the field,
 For the birth-right belongs to our nation :
 They were born—aye—after love divided heaven above,
 But we ere the sun took his station.
 For the blessings of man's days, to us is due the praise,
 To us, human kind's benefactors.
 For our own private reasons, we're the heralds of the seasons,
 In spring, summer, winter, autumn, the chief actors.

from every clime under heaven—long-billed, short-billed, and no bill at all; with tails and without; crested and bald, until the whole stage is filled with this most original and ancient ornithological society. The project is discussed and, after considerable hesitation, adopted by the society: the name of the city is chosen, the presiding deity elected, each tribe of birds receives its orders, and the foundation of the circuit of the walls is forthwith commenced. During the departure of the working birds to their posts, Peisthetairos proceeds to the dedication of the new city, and is successively interrupted by a poet with ready-made verses, a geometrician with round and square plans, a legislator with a code of liberal laws, and an inspector all eyes; all and each of them eager for employment in the new city and state of Nephelococcygia. On account of these interruptions, Peisthetairos retires from the stage, to complete within doors the oft-interrupted dedicatory sacrifice.

During his absence the birds proceed to chaunt the glories of their dominion of old, and the advantages to accrue to mankind on their return to office. Peisthetairos returns with his hands full of business; he has to give orders, to hear the report of the building committee, to place proper guards; in short, to do all the work of projector, architect, king, lords, commons, and executive. In the midst of all his troubles, in rushes a breathless messenger to tell how that Iris, disregarding watchword and countersign, has broken through the city on her way from heaven to earth. Pursued and caught, the bold intrudress is questioned by Peisthetairos, declares her journey to be earthward, its object to demand the instant renewal of sacrificial-vapour supplies, denounces Jove's vengeance against the rebels, and, unable to resist the strong claws of the birds, flies "back again." The herald sent to earth by Peisthetairos,

Why the farmer sows his grain, when for Libya starts the crane,
 And the sailor hauls his boat high on shore:
 Then the winter's cold is near, and then robbers may ye fear,
 And thick cloaks must be made for the poor:
 When the kite sails into Greece, ye must shear the woolly fleece,
 Strip the flocks of their warm winter coats;
 But a summer vest now buy, for the swallow sails on high,
 And away with your shaggy capotes:
 Your deity, old Jove, sits the world so far above—
 Be he king of his own cloudy regions,
 We'll be your gods on earth—from the moment of your birth,
 We'll give you luck and happiness by legions,
 Long life, and youth, and health, wit, feasting, dancing, wealth,
 And strange things, like our best milk of pigeons."

returns with "news of the birds' victory to their joyful king," relates how all on earth are seized with the ornitho-mania, and are coming, thick as the leaves in Vallambrosa, "to visit and subscribe allegiance to the new gods." The human visitants are rather of the "selecti e profanis"—a parricide, a dithyrambic poet, and a sycophant; the first to be allowed to beat and kill his parents according to birdlaw; the second to be fledged, that he may fly aloft and gather airy thoughts; and the last, that he may fly from place to place, informing here, there, and everywhere, at once, he being a firm believer in Sir Boyle Roach's creed, "that a man cannot be in two places at once barring he was a bird. These suppliants thrashed off, Prometheus shirks on under an umbrella, and thus hidden from the gaze of Jupiter, "turns snitch upon his palls" (to use Mr. Ainsworth's fashionable dictionary), and reveals the famishing state of the dwellers on Olympus. He has hardly shrunk off under his gingham, ere an embassy arrives from the gods to patch up a peace on the best terms possible. Neptune, Hercules, and a Triballian god, who hardly understands, and certainly cannot speak, Greek, are the plenipotentiaries. Neptune fights for good terms, and is backed by Hercules, until the charms of a good feed, and the smell of the good things preparing under his very nose, seduce this ever-hungry god from his duty. He forthwith rats, and being joined by the Triballian, a truce on the modern reciprocity, or all-on-one-side system, is concluded: the gods get food, and the birds their ancient sovereignty, and their king is rewarded with the hand of Jove's own daughter, Basilæa.

From such quaint and amusing materials is it possible to elicit a continued series of political allusions to, and caricatures of, any serious subject, and much less such an one as the great Sicilian expedition? "Non fumum ex fulgore sed ex fumo dare lucem." Nothing like trying.

Now, before we proceed to our view of the case, let us premise that this is not the first time that a political interpretation has been given to this play. Ages ago it was believed that the gods were the Athenians—the birds, Spartans—Nephelococcygia, the fortress of Deceleia—and the intention, to starve out Athens. If the author of this interpretation meant the actual building of the fortress, he endued our author with the* power of second sight, as the first stone of that fortress was

* The departure of the expedition to Sicily is generally placed under the year of Arimnestus, but as it was not until after Midsummer, *θέρους μεσδύντος ἡδῆ*, and the new Archons came in at Midsummer, the fleet must have sailed during the year of Chabrias, in which the argument with the birds is corrected by Philochorus, *apud Schol. Aves.*

not laid until a full year after the drama was acted. If he merely alluded to the advice of Alcibiades, why even then he left for the entire, thinking out, composition, rehearsal and getting up of the play, a space of time too short even for the ready wit and persevering industry of Aristophanes. Besides, to have represented the fickle Athenians by sober Dorian deities—the sober, slow, but sure Spartans, by volatile birds, were enough to have ensured the rejection of the drama by such a quick-witted audience as were present at its first appearance.

To recover the lost key of this play, we must first discover who and what are the parties, the actors in this busy scene; what nation is hidden under the form of men, what under that of birds, and what under that of starved deities; the first the originators, the second the undertakers, the last the sufferers from this most original scheme. The classes once determined, we must apply a similar method of investigation to the individual actors of the drama: and, referring to the events in the political world at the time of the play, and shortly antecedent to its representation, discover the originals of the shrewd Peis-thetairos, the gullible Euelpides, the more gullible Epps, Prometheus the king's evidence, and the outwitted, out-proccolled negociators.

However different, at first sight, the contending parties may appear, a closer and more careful investigation assures us of their similarity in very many of their habits and customs, as well public as private; and enables us to lay down this primary rule, that, although they may differ, as one tribe does and will from its immediate neighbour, yet that they are all of one nation, or rather, tribes situated in different parts of one great country—of whom two, namely the birds and the gods, have been contending from very ancient times for the rule over the other and inferior tribe of men. That the gods and birds are each tribes of Greece, we may conclude from the prevalence of the laws of Solon among both parties; that the men are also of that land, the great similarity and almost identity of their habits, morals, and manners, with those of the birds, may be taken as conclusive evidence. To which, then, of the many component tribes of Greece shall we liken these three contending parties?

Among the Greeks, to whom shall we liken the greatest actors in this drama, the ancient nation of the birds? Do we

(767)—the play was performed *ἐπὶ Χαβρίου Ἀρχοντος*, 'eis 'άστν consequently, in the spring of the year 414 B.C.; Deceleia was founded in the year after, and Alcibiades must have fled to Sparta in the fall of the year preceding the representation, or about four months before the play was brought out. See Clinton's *Fasti*, year 414 B.C.

not, in them, recognise the volatile and fickle Antochthones of Attica? the fellow-citizens of Solon, Themistocles, and Cleon? In the fickleness of the winged race, as shewn in their sudden alteration of conduct towards Peisthetairos and Euelpides soon after their first introduction to these two worthies—in their partiality for subtle refinements and sophistry (312),* in their love for projects which flattered their vanity and fostered their inordinate desire of universal dominion,† in their admission of runaway slaves (748),‡ in their daily occupation from an early age in the coining of laws and decrees (1248),§ in the conduct of the young towards their parents (746),|| we may perceive a direct and cutting satire on the follies and vices so peculiar to the people of Attica, and to the inhabitants of her metropolis in particular. Moreover, in this play the birds are particularly charged with flying about with open mouths, ever gaping—*χεχηνότες* (166), a propensity of the Athenians, noticed by the same writer in “The Knights” (1262), and by Demosthenes as still their vice, in his first “Philippic.”¶ Again, add to this evidence, the form of the dedication *ἀντοῖσι καὶ χίοισι* (855),** the election of Minerva Polias as Protectress of Nephelococcygia (808),†† the transplanting the *φυλὴ Κέκροπις* among the

* See the description of Peisthetairos, beginning *ἄφατον ὡς φρόνιμος* quoted afterwards.

† See the entire chorus from 725—780.

‡ Χο—*εἰδὲ τυγχάνει τις ὑμῶν δραπέτης ἐστιγμένος
ἄτταγας οὗτος παρ’ ἡμῖν ποικίλος κεκλήσεται.*—*Avos.* 748.

§ Αγγ— *πάντα δ’ ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς
ποιοῦσι ἅπαρ ὄρνιθες ἐκμμούμενοι.
πρῶτον μὲν εὐθὺς πάντες ἐξ ευνῆς ἄμα
ἔπέτονθ’ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ νομόν
Κάπειτ’ ἂν ἄμα κατήραν ἐς τα βιβλία
εἰτ’ ἀπενέμοντ’ ἐνταῦθα τὰ ψηφίσματα.*—*Avos.* 1244.

|| Χο—*εἰ γὰρ ἐνθάδ’ ἐστὶν αἰσχρὸν τὸν πατέρα τύπτειν νόμῳ
τοῦτ’ ἐκεῖ καλὸν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐστίν, ἣν τις τῷ πατρὶ
προσδραμὼν ἔπη πατάξας, αἶρε πλήκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ.*—*Avos.* 744

¶ ΑΑ—*Καὶ μὴν ἐγὼ σέ, ὦ Δῆμα, θεραπεύσω καλῶς,
ὥσθ’ ὁμολογῇς σε μηδέν’ ἀνθρώπων ἐμοῦ
ἰδεῖν ἄμεινον τῇ Κεχηνάϊων πόλει.*—*Eqvites.* 1262.

ΠΕ—*μὴ περιπέτεσθε πανταχῇ κεχηνότες.*—*Avos.* 166.

** ΙΕ—*διδόναί Νεφελοκοκκυγισιν ὑγίειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν, ἅντοῖσι καὶ
χίοισι,*

ΠΕ—*χίοισιν ἥσθην πανταχοῦ προσκειμένοις.*—855.

†† ΕΥ—*λαπαρὸν τὸ χρῆμα τῆς πόλεως τίς δαὶ θεὸς πολιοῦχος ἔσται;
τῷ ξανοῦμεν τὸν πέπλον*

ΠΕ—*τί’ δ’ οὐκ Ἀθηναίαν ἐώμεν πολιάδα;*—806-8.

U 2

birds (1366),* and, last, the epithet of *λιπαραι*, the favorite epithet of Athens, the burthen of Pindar's "Ode to the *λιπαραι* και 'αοιδίμοι 'Αθῆναι,"—for which poem he was fined by his jealous countrymen, and rewarded by the Athenians with a statue and the more substantial honour of the red gold. How the Athenians prided themselves on this epithet, Aristophanes has humorously shown in his "Acharnians" (584); a place well worthy of comparison with the 806th line of this play.† These scraps and bits of evidence, when united, almost force us to adopt the view of the matter taken by the learned Professor, that the birds are the fit and proper representatives of the Athenian people. The men hold a station of dependence alike on gods and birds, they are the prize of the contest, and are to be transferred, willy nilly, from the conquered to the conquerors. They are Greeks, but not Athenians, alike in many points and differing in many others—are they not the representatives of those dependent tribes of Greece, whose allegiance was ever transferred from the weaker to the stronger party? And, then, who were the gods? in their descent they were very birdlike juniors, indeed, to the ancient Lords of Heaven, but still of the same descent; like the men they were greedy, voluptuous, and sensual, and compelled to pay obedience to the birds—friends, indeed, to men, but at enmity with the new city and its inhabitants—once lords of Heaven and patrons of earth. By this new plot to be deprived of their ancient sovereignty—the means by which their ruin was to be worked, starvation—the agents of the plot, their ancient enemies the birds, joined with their former dependents the men; or, to descend from the clouds, Sparta, the ancient rival of the Athenians, by a union of all, even her former dependents, with her old enemy, were to be starved into submission, and the Hegemony of Greece transferred to the Athenian people. Do we not now perceive why the *dramatis personæ* of this play should bear a family likeness as Greeks, but, at the same time, characteristic differences as Lacedæmonians, Athenians, and the remaining nations of Greece.

* ΠΕ—βουλει διδάσκειν καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν οὖν μένων
 Λεωτροφιδῇ χορὸν πετομένων ὀρνέων
 Κεκροπίδα φύλῃν;—1364-6.

† ΕΥ—λιπαρὸν τὸ χρῆμα τῆς πόλεως.—*Aves.* 806.

Χο—εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπένυσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθῆνας
 εὔρετο πᾶν ἄν διὰ τὰς λιπαρὰς, ἀφύων τιμὴν περιάψας—
Acharn. 584.

Χο—ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέζανοι 'καὶ ἀριφῆλῳτοι 'Αθῆναι.—
Equites. 1329.

The actors discovered—to what expedition of the Athenians shall we liken the building of this city in mid-air, and the fatal consequences that resulted to the representatives of the Lacedæmonians from its foundation? Our Professor says, the great Sicilian expedition, and the ultimate projects consequent upon its success as conceived by Alcibiades and his partisans—and we think he proves his theory. For we must not suppose that the ultimate object of this expedition was the mere conquest of the small though fruitful island of Sicily; that isle subjugated, it looked forward to the conquest of Italy and Carthage, that from the almost inexhaustible resources of those countries a navy might be constructed and equipped, sufficient to blockade the Peloponnesians, starve out the Spartans and their adherents, and transfer the Hegemony of Greece from the Dorian to the Ionian race.

The historian of the Peloponnesian war, when commenting on the first speech of Alcibiades on the Sicilian expedition, assigns, as the origin of that orator's eagerness, his expectation of eventually gaining possession of Italy and Carthage by that armament. Again, Alcibiades, when replying to the cautious speech of Nicias, indicates that the conquest of Sicily would probably lead to the subjugation of the entire Peloponnesians beneath the power of the Athenians.* This reserve, in a public oration, was no more than prudent, as any premature disclosure of its intended extension might have appeared so very visionary and impracticable, as to have been the means of causing the rejection of the scheme even by an Athenian ecclesia.

In the year following, when he had escaped to Sparta, he then, in order to render his appeal to the Spartans more forcible, openly declared the ultimate objects of that plan as they had existed in the minds and wishes of that large body of the Athenian populace who looked up to him as their leader.† “We undertook, then, this expedition (said the son of Clinias, to the Spartan gerusia), in order, if we could, to subdue, first of all the Siceliots, and after them the inhabitants of Italy; and then to attempt the dependencies of the Carthaginians and Carthage herself. Finally, if these or most of these enterprises had succeeded, we should then have made an attack on the Peloponnesians, bringing thither the whole force of Greece sup-

* Καὶ ἐλπίζων Σικελίαν τε δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ

Καρχηδόνα λήψεσθαι.—*Thuc.* vi. 15.

Καὶ ἅμα ἡ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῶν ἐκεῖ προσγενομένων, πάσης τῇ εἰκότι ἄρξομεν.—*Thuc.* vi. 18.

† This is the principal passage on the subject, for a paraphrase of which see Plutarch's Alcib. 17. ; and for a similar view, Plut. Nicias 12.

plied by those countries, and taking into our pay numerous barbarians:* we should also have built triremes in addition to our present fleet, from the forest of Italy: and *then blockading the Peloponnese with our navy* and attacking it with our armies, taking some cities by assault and others by siege, we expected that we should easily subdue it and, after that, rule over the whole Greek nation. The conquered lands, each as it was reduced, would furnish supplies for further conquests without burdening our own country." This view† admits of further confirmation from the works of Aristides the rhetorician, Libanius, and Plutarch. Thucydides does not express the smallest doubt of such a project having been really entertained by the partisans of Alcibiades: and not only is it not disputed by any other ancient writer, but, on the contrary, the same views are expressed by others, and those of undoubted authority. Suppose, then, this expedition to have been successful—the maritime towns of Sicily, Italy, and Lybia, in the possession of the Athenians—the mastery of the sea secured by her countless triumphs—every harbour of Peloponnese blockaded—Lybian gold seducing mercenaries from their masters—the combined contingents of the great allied army drawn across the narrow neck of the Isthmus: compare the situation of the Spartans under this complication of enemies with that of the half-starved gods of the drama—compelled, by dire want and griping famine, either to war to the knife, or to yield their long grasped sceptre to their inveterate and restless enemies.

This comparison instituted, are we not compelled to admit the conclusions of the Professor, and to believe that we are enabled, through his researches, to read aright the great political lesson which our author dared to read to his critics, his rulers, his despotic lords. The birds were advised to leave their baneful habit of fluttering about without any settled purpose, open-mouthed for every bit of wonderment that was afloat, dissatisfied with each other, satisfied with themselves: were to league together in amity, lay aside all party strife and political bickerings, and to build one vast and noble city, a fortress of offence as well as defence. The Athenians were no more to waste their energetic powers in multifarious, trivial, and unconnected plans—

* Τριῖρεις τε πρὸς ταῖς ἡμετέραις πολλὰς ναυπηγησάμενοι, ἐχούσης τῆς Ἰταλίας ξύλα ἀφθονα, οἷς τὴν πελοπόννησον περίξ πολιορκούντες, καὶ τῷ πεζῷ ἅμα ἐκ γῆς ἐφορμαῖς, τῶν πολεῶν τὰς μὲν βία, λαβόντες, τὰς δ' ἐντειχισάμενοι, ῥαδίως ἡλπίζομεν καταπολεμήσειν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τοῦ ξύμπαντος Ἑλληνικοῦ ἀρξείν.—Lib. vi. 91.

† Cited in pages 15-23 of Mr. Hamilton's able translation.

were to eschew their love of novelty, their habit of gaping after the *το κάινον*—were to leave off finding out faults in their neighbours and to look at home—were to unite in some one vast project, and by one—

“longer, stronger pull,
And a pull altogether, as they say
At sea,”

to arrive at the summit of political prosperity and power.

If the whole action of the drama be not (as we have endeavoured to shew) a mere poetical fiction, but contains an historical substance, we may antecedently expect that the principal actors in the plot will be the representatives, either of the great factions of the day, or of some of the more prominent leaders of that eventful period. The most important persons in the drama are Peisthetairos, Euelpides, and Epops, the originators and fosterers of the plot—Prometheus (the renegade) and the three ambassadors from the gods—Neptune, Hercules, and the Triballian plenipotentiary. Alcibiades, the originator, promoter, defender, and carrier out of the Sicilian scheme, was as much and intimately connected with the details of that expedition, as his representative, the refugee Peisthetairos, with the proposing and conducting of the building of Nephelococcygia. We must look upon Peisthetairos, however, not so much as the representative of a solitary individual, but rather of the followers of that individual,—of that party which projected the Sicilian scheme—of the son of Clinias *and his faction*. The parallel between them is most striking: he who on the stage projects, recommends, defends, and finally accomplishes the building of Nephelococcygia, is the proper representative of him who hatched, reared, and, eventually, carried through, the motion for the Sicilian expedition in the ecclesia of Athens. The *ἄφατον ὡς φρόνιμος* of the drama, is the prudent politician of the ecclesia—the *πυκνότατον κίναδος, σύφισμα, κύρμα, τρίμμα, and παιπάλημα* of the play, is none other than the crafty, sophistical, cunning unprincipled leader of the Alcibiadæan faction in Athens. As Peisthetairos, selfish, ambitious, thirsting after power, careless of the means so that he obtained his end, turning all to his own profit, and eager to unite himself to Jove's own daughter, *Βασιλεια*—the political supremacy in Greece.

In confining our view of Peisthetairos within these limits, we have ventured to differ from the learned Professor, who makes him of the composite order; his sophist qualifications representing the character of Gorgias of Leontium—his political that of Alcibiades. Our Professor can hardly have given sufficient

importance to the education of that politician, when he doubts his having been sufficiently initiated in the craft of sophistry to merit the terms applied to his dramatic representative by our author. Another difficulty seems to have been, the application of the term *πρέσβυς* to Peisthetairos, as irreconcilable with the age of Alcibiades at the time of the Sicilian expedition. Setting aside the constant use of the word as a term of respect, and not as any indication of age, surely too accurate a likeness of one so powerful and so vindictive was hardly to be attempted by Aristophanes after the persecution he had experienced from Cleon, and the rejection of his favorite play of "The Clouds," in a former year, through the interest of that very demagogue whom he was now holding up to the ridicule of the Athenian people. Euelpides is the representative of that party at Athens whom the moving eloquence and crafty sophistry of Alcibiades led where and how he pleased—that body of beardless frequenters of the ecclesia, those unfledged senators (whether high or low, one and all epicureans in their morals, sceptics in their religion) described by Thucydides as hurrying on the expedition, from their desire of visiting foreign countries, and though danger stared them in the face, *Ἐυέλπιδες ὄντες σωθήσεσθαι*. And here we again fall out with our guide, who, following out his former extravagant notion about Gorgias, has converted Euelpides into Polus, the pupil and companion of the sophist of Leontium. However dependent He of Agrigentum may have been on the greater He—of Leontium, it is a poor compliment to compare him with Euelpides, who never rises above the place of the mere "famulus" of Peisthetairos, and who occupies nearly the same situation in this drama as Xanthias does in "The Frogs." Much more happy is our Professor in his detection of the hero Lamachus in the triple-crested Epops. A priori, we should have looked for the third commander of the expedition in this drama; and under what guide he appears, a comparison of passages will shew. Is there not an allusion to the prevailing love of that officer for lofty crest and floating plumes (so exquisitely ridiculed in "the Acharnians") in that exclamation of Euelpides on his first sight of the King of the Birds—*τίς ἢ πτέρωσις; τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς τριλοφίας;*? No hint at his pecuniary embarrassments in the well-plucked appearance of his own body and that of his heir-apparent? The scheme-hunting, moulting, debt-pressed King of the Birds, is a fit representative of that military leader, who, when appointed to a command, charged the people for his kit and suit of regimentals, borrowed money and never repaid it, but was well plucked by sycophants and money-lenders. The scheme formed and the plan carried out, his representative takes

the same place in the drama as Lamachus did in the expedition—that of comparative obscurity.

Before we investigate the subject of the gods and their plenipos, let us first discover how far the pitiable picture of the state of the birds, as contrasted with their previous condition, corresponded with that of the Athenians during the eighteenth year of the Peloponnesian war. Since the politic expedition of Brasidas, and the failure of the attempt of Cleon to recover their lost dependencies and authority in the north, the distressing and humiliating defeats of Oropus and Delium had diminished the weight and influence of the Athenians among the nations north of the Gulph of Corinth. Held in contempt by the Bæotians, who had dared to cheat their former lords out of the border fortress of Panacktum, they had become so lethargic as to tempt some of their more immediate dependents to revolt. They had now arrived at that critical point in their affairs, when the remedy must either kill or cure; some overpowering deed of daring was required to restore their lost consequence; their existence as an independent nation depended on their arousing themselves from that fatal lethargy into which they had sunk after the peace of Nicias. Formed for taking no rest themselves, and permitting none else to take ought of quiet or repose, their power had been born and nurtured in dangers and distresses; and it was in dangerous times alone that the peculiar ability and resources of that nation appeared. Their sceptre, equally with that of the birds, had slipped from their hands as they slept; and equally with these, their representatives, did they require one united effort to restore them to their lost position.

The renegade Prometheus next claims our attention; the representative of that party in each State, who, when matters seemed likely to take a turn, secretly made terms with the besiegers, blew into life the all but dead embers of the democratic party, and either forced the defenders into a dishonourable surrender, or, by betraying their plans to the enemy, opened the gates to their new lords. The triumvirate of ambassadors admits of an easy solution; Neptune the lord of the sea, the patron of the Bimarine Corinth, comes forward as the representative of those bitter enemies of Athens, who had stirred up the dull spirit of Sparta and kept alive the enmity of the confederates by continued and individual solicitation. The Corinthians thus ably represented by their presiding deity, Hercules, the son of Theban soil, the great Bæotian hero, represents the faithful Bæotian allies of the Lacedæmonians—his Spartan qualifications obscured, his Bæotian put forward, that the representation may be more vivid and evident. The Tri-

ballian with his barbarized Greek, reminds the spectators of those wild Nomad tribes to the north of Greece, who favoured the cause of Lacedæmon. The Triballi had lately defeated Sitalces, the ally of Athens, if not in strict concert with, yet certainly to the advantage of the opponents of Athens. The Illyrians, too, had lately deserted from Perdiccas and joined the army of Brasidas. The circumstances in which these nations were 'placed, partly as friends of Lacedæmon, and partly as enemies to Athens, called for the introduction of their representative among the ambassadors from the gods. As might be expected, he is a silent, though important, vote; careless of the result of the war, the prospect of immediate relief from starvation inclines him to the side of the dinner-seeking Hercules, and his grumbled assent gives the victory to the birds.

In the construction of the city's wall, and in the terms used when speaking of it, much additional information may be gathered in support of our position; particularly as relates to that wall being the representative of the blockading squadron. The work is described as exclusively the labour of sea and water fowl. The noise of the hewing out of the gates is compared with that of a dockyard. The address to Iris *πλοῖον ἢ κυνῇ*—the use of the words *ὦ Κατακέλευσον, ὦσπ', στύομαι τριέμβολον*—the question *τῷ πτέρυγι ποῖ ναυστολεῖς*—the answer given to the challenge by Iris*—the presence of koliarchs and ornitharchs in the pursuit of the bold ambadress—the naval cries of *εὐράξ, παράξ* used by Peisthetairos; all tended to lead the minds of the audience from the brick and mortar of the city's wall to the wooden circuit of Athenian guardships; whilst the assistance rendered by the 30,000 Libyan cranes, told of the conquest of Libya as previous to that of Peloponnese. Substitute, then, for the horizon and atmosphere of the theatre, the expanded sea—for the wall, Athenian fleets spread round the Peloponnese—for Peisthetairos, Euelpides, and Epops, read Alcibiades and his partisans, and the hero Lamachus—imagine Neptune a Corinthian ambassador—Hercules, the Bæotian representative—Triballus, the barbarian plenipotentiary—Prometheus, a renegade—Jove and his hungry gods, Spartans—the birds, Athenians—the men, the dependent States of Greece; compare all this with the anticipated results of the great Sicilian expedition, as plainly declared by the historian of the great war—the charge of purposelessness seems to fail, and our drama to

* ΠΕ—*ὄνομα δέ σοι τί ἐστι, πλοῖον, ἢ κυνῇ;*

ΙΡ—*Ἰρις ταχῆα*

ΠΕ— *πάραλος ἢ Σαλαμινιά;*

rise far, far, above the more evidently political comedies of the ingenious author. Those comic curiosities, the chorus of birds, perform their part (as far as they represent the frivolous and volatile people of Athens) with sound common sense, and a just feeling of distrust for a stranger who is stealing in among them, and whose admission they vehemently oppose until their anger is appeased by a few sophistical sentences; and then, led away by the charms of novelty and captivated by this subtle flattery, their ambition and their thirst for foreign dominion carries them away; and then, again, when peace is concluded, they receive with hymns of praise their new tyrant (who is to gain all the advantages of their hard-earned treaty) and glorify the instrument whose dupe they have been, and are, and will continue to be, until some newer and more tempting demagogue dethrone him, and step into his vacant place. Who can doubt the portrait—alas, for the painter's skill. We have not space to follow out the very accurate investigations of the Professor; but strongly recommend the perusal of this work to all our readers, who take sufficient interest in the plays of Aristophanes to be far from satisfied with this our short compendium. Like most of his school, the Professor has too often descended to verbal coincidences, and, led away by the novelty of his subject and the success of his theory, has been tempted to ride his hobby rather too fast. "In laying the translation of this essay before the public (says Mr. Hamilton), the translator confines himself to the expression of his own earnest conviction, that Professor Siuvern has fully and completely succeeded in proving the proposition he has advanced; and he feels confident, that though some minor points may be objected to, this conviction will be felt by all who will take the trouble to read the essay, and to try the truth of its contents by a frequent reference to the play itself and to the authorities quoted by the writer."

ART. III.—*The Silurian System, &c.* By RODERICK IMPEY MURCHISON, F.R.S., F.L.S., &c. &c. In Two Parts. London: Murray. 1839.

2. *Report of the Geology of Cornwall, Devon, and West Somerset.* By HENRY T. DE LA BECHE, F.R.S., &c. Published by Order of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. London: Longman. 1839.

THE History of Geology is, in many respects, very much unlike the history of any other science, depending on the observation of phenomena, and belonging to the class denominated "Induc-

tive :”—Existing only, for centuries, in the crude speculations of cosmogonists, the real facts, upon which all reasoning must be based, were either unknown or absolutely neglected ; and, so far as any rational and scientific object is concerned, the incidental remarks of Herodotus and Ovid may be considered quite as valuable as those “theories of the earth,” published at a period so late as the seventeenth century, in which the *invention* of an hypothesis was the great and sole merit of the theoriser. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that the first dawn of Geology as a science, was the study of fossils (*i. e.* of the remains of organized bodies found embedded in various strata) commenced in Italy about the year 1520, and followed up, chiefly in that country, by descriptions and figures of the most remarkable discoveries, made public at various intervals, during the remainder of that century. It was thus that facts were accumulated and recorded, and the was opened for the reception of a highly-interesting and important doctrine, viz., that the various beds of which the earth’s surface is composed are characterized, and may be identified, by certain groups of fossils and particular forms of animal life. Before, however, the importance of this generalization had been felt, much had been effected, by the mineralogists and Geological theorists of the German school, and the labours of Werner had seemed to throw so much light on the mineral structure of rocks, that the importance of fossils became, for a time, under-rated, and a retrograde movement took place, retarding the progress of real scientific Geology. The effect of this retardation was long felt in the wordy and angry discussions of the supporters of two theories concerning the origin of rocks, which are commonly spoken of as the igneous and aqueous theories, because the supporters of the one—the Plutonists of that day—called in the aid of subterraneous heat and the action of fire ; while the Neptunists, on the other hand, accounted for all phenomena on the supposition that every appearance was the result of deposition from water.

By the exertions of Dr. Hutton, aided by the active researches of other hard-working Geologists, those unfounded theories which had attracted attention and discussion for their ingenuity rather than their intrinsic importance, became gradually neglected, and a new order of things, a stricter enquiry into facts, and a series of well-attested observations, became looked upon as indispensable qualifications for all who pretended to a knowledge of Geology. The errors and dogmas of the schoolmen were replaced by more accurate information and rational deductions, and Geologists became willing to allow that their theories ought to depend on facts, instead of being satisfied with suppositions

and assertions. For these reasons, owing also, perhaps, partly to the institution of a society "with a view to record and multiply observations," and partly to an improved and more staid and philosophical feeling among those who occupied themselves in the investigation of natural phenomena, there began to be separated from a confused mass of contradictory hypotheses the framework of a science, definite in its objects, clear in its statements, surpassingly wonderful in the results to which it leads and the facts it unfolds, and allied to other sciences, assisting them, and assisted by them, enlarging the bounds of human knowledge, and next, perhaps, to astronomy, the most ennobling to the human intellect.

As a *science*, then, Geology, after a long sleep of ages, has within a few years started into active existence, and made efforts to expand itself and fill the space in the great treasure-house of human knowledge which must belong to it. In our own country, the amount of actual information obtained was far greater, more useful and universally applicable, than could possibly have been anticipated; and, owing to peculiar circumstances, and the early progress made in secondary Geology by the venerable Dr. Smith, it has so happened, that England has served as an index-map to Europe, offering to our notice within a small space, almost all the varieties of strata elsewhere spread over a large extent of country. From the chalk downwards, English names and English types have become European; and, in many cases, the barbarous local terms for particular sub-soils, such as *lias*, *cornbrash*, and others, have become current among all Geologists.

Judging from the works before us, this honour our country is not likely soon to be deprived of; and we may expect to read of Silurian formations of Norway, and the Devonian rocks of other parts of Europe, as we do of the *Kimmeridge clay* or *Oxford clay* in the Jura, and the *mountain limestone* of Germany.

For the benefit, however, of those of our readers who have not made themselves acquainted with the daily additions to the stock of knowledge that render the pursuit of Geology so peculiarly fascinating, we proceed to give, in a few words, some account of what has been going on for the last few years. This we shall do in such a way as to communicate as far as possible a notion of the value of the services which Mr. Murchison has rendered to science. He has elaborately worked out the detail of a district, interesting in a degree scarcely credible to the uninitiated; a district which presents as a claim to attention, besides its intrinsic importance, the additional charm of entire novelty.

It is very rarely that there comes before us a scientific work like this, so peculiarly interesting and authentic in itself, and so admirable both for its picturesque illustrations and for the extreme delicacy and accuracy of the numerous *scientific* engravings. We feel, indeed, that in order to do it justice, we must depart from the beaten track of reviewers, and, neglecting for once the destructive propensity, be contented to admire and wonder.

Up to the year 1830, the fossiliferous strata formed by aqueous deposit were commonly divided into tertiary, secondary, and transition; the latter term sometimes interchanging with *grauwacke* in Germany, and signifying an indefinite and not very easily understood group, whose fossils, when there were any, were supposed identifiable with those of the carboniferous series; and, as the name imports, indicating an intermediate condition between aqueous and igneous rocks.

These transition rocks were all referred to the same Geological period, or at least no definite line of demarcation had been discovered, and several bands of limestone which had been observed, and cursorily examined, and which passed under the general name of "transition limestones," were without much examination presumed to belong to the fossiliferous deposits of the carboniferous series.

At the time, therefore, when Mr. Murchison commenced his labours, "no one (as he observes) was aware of the existence below the old red sandstone (a group subordinate to the mountain limestone) of a regular series of deposits containing peculiar organic remains."—*Sil. Sys.* p. 4. It should not, however, be forgotten, that before this time Professor Sedgwick had prepared himself for the solution of this and other most difficult Geological problems of the kind, by his examination of the Cumberland slates; and after spending several years upon this great and difficult task, he, with our author, commenced the Geological examination of the whole principality of Wales. By a mutual arrangement, entered into, we believe, in the summer of 1831, they agreed to undertake the laborious work separately, Professor Sedgwick going into North Wales, because there the greatest difficulties were expected, and the most accurate and practical knowledge of the older* and altered rocks was required; while to Mr. Murchison fell the south-eastern district, which was supposed to be more nearly analogous to known secondary deposits. In this division of labour, therefore, the

* The Geological reader will be aware that, from the position of the strata in England (all tilted towards the East), the older formations appear necessarily in the West, and make their appearance one after another as we advance towards the Western coast.

more easy, fertile, and interesting portion fell to the lot of Mr. Murchison, whose reference to his fellow-labourer we are happy to have an opportunity of quoting, as it forms a just tribute to the exertions of one whose name will long live as among the greatest of British Geologists :

“In speaking of the labours of my friend (observes Mr. Murchison), I may truly say that he not only shed an entirely new light on the crystalline arrangement, or slaty cleavage, of the North Welch mountains, but also overcame what, to most men, would have proved insurmountable difficulties, in determining the order and relations of these very ancient strata and scenes of vast dislocation. He further made several traverses across the region in which I was employed, and sanctioning the arrangement I had adopted, he not only gave me confidence in its accuracy, but enhanced the value of my work by enabling me to unite it with his own, and thus have our joint exertions led to a general view of the sequence of the older fossiliferous deposits.”—*Murchison*, p. 6.

We have been thus particular in calling attention to the labours of Professor Sedgwick, because we do not think that *in the world* he has yet received credit for the many years of most arduous labour which he has spent in examining the structure of North Wales, bringing to bear, as he did upon that examination, a greater amount of qualifications than any other English or foreign Geologist could boast of possessing. We pass on now to other circumstances connected with the Silurian System.

The first general view of the discovery—for so it must be called—of a series of well-defined strata forming a natural group, and occurring below the old red sandstone, was given at the meeting of the British Association, held at York, in 1831. It was not till two years afterwards, at the close of the summer of 1833, that a synopsis was published of its various formations ; and during the succeeding six years almost the whole attention of our author was given to the developement of the subject and its collateral branches.

We believe it is now the intention of Mr. Murchison to follow out his researches on the continent, to reduce the incomprehensible *grauwacke* of the Germans into order ; to show, if possible, the contemporaneity of various continental strata with the Silurian rocks of our own country ; and, perhaps, also the passage of the carboniferous system into the Silurian, by a series of fossiliferous deposits, identical in geological position with the coarse conglomerate called “old red sandstone,” and the shales of Devonshire and Cornwall.

Whatever may be the result of these enquiries and examinations—and, with so persevering and patient an examiner as

Mr. Murchison, the most satisfactory results may be anticipated—we are happy, now, to have the opportunity of extending more widely a knowledge of what has *already been done*, and informing a class of readers not, perhaps, very likely to read “The Silurian System,” of the meaning and value of the very costly work bearing that title. If, indeed, there is any fault to be found, it must be the regret that we feel, and that every Geologist must feel, that a work so useful and admirable is put, by its price, out of the power of ordinary people to purchase. Its circulation is limited to the few who can afford to have their libraries enriched by a scientific work, uniting the charms of a series of exquisite engravings representing the most picturesque scenery, with the less striking but more useful figures of upwards of five hundred fossils and parts of fossils, and more than a hundred coloured Geological sections. In addition to these, there is a very large separate map of the whole district, admirably executed and minutely accurate.

It is a fact pretty generally known, that underneath the great mass of red sandstone, which is the cause of the fertility and beauty of the counties of Warwickshire, Staffordshire, &c., in the middle of England, there lies a series of deposits, of which *coal* forms so prominent a part, in actual quantity as well as economic value, as to give to the whole series the name of “the coal measures.” So well is this fact known locally, that, in some places, persons have been found—acquainted with the general law of the succession of deposits, but totally ignorant of Geology—who have vainly and hopelessly attempted to find beds of coal, merely from the occurrence of sandstone at the surface. This has been done in places where, if coal exist at all, it must be so deep in the bowels of the earth as to render it contrary to all probability that success can ever crown their efforts. In coal districts the sandstone, however, may be frequently seen, and is often bored through in searching for a new bed; and from the frequent appearance of the sandstone upon the coal measure, the order of deposition is easily and satisfactorily made out. The general law of adherence to Geological position—that is, of two or more beds being invariably found in the same relative position—has been so often verified, and is placed so entirely beyond doubt by experience, that we need not here do more than allude to it.

If, now, we turn to the Forest of Dean, in Gloucestershire, we find there also abundance of coal, and by paying attention to the outskirts of the district, we shall see that it rests on all sides as in a basin upon underlying beds of a coarse grit, and this again upon a blue fossiliferous limestone, which may be, and has been iden-

tified with similar limestones in Derbyshire and the North of England, and is known to Geologists under the name of "mountain limestone." The coal and the slaty beds or shales among which it is found—the coarse gritstone used for manufacturing millstones, and thence called millstone-grit—and the mountain limestone, form altogether one system or group of deposits, and this system is known as the "Carboniferous System." We have already observed that until Mr. Murchison's labours had pointed out the difference, these beds had been supposed to represent the lowest in position, and, therefore, the earliest formed of all fossiliferous deposits.

It may be as well, perhaps, here to remind the reader of a few fundamental principles of Geology which have been abundantly made out by the most definite experiments and the most accurate examination, because, without bearing them constantly in mind he will be unable to appreciate the full force of the evidence adduced by Mr. Murchison in support of his opinions and views. They are these:—

"First. That the outer shell of the earth is made up of a number of layers, or strata superimposed one upon another, very numerous, and varying much in appearance and nature; and that these strata are, for the most part, not concentrically placed, but tilted up, and disturbed sometimes at great angles, though sometimes lying nearly horizontal.

"Second. That so far as investigation has hitherto gone, the strata or beds thus observed must have been formed at the bottom of water, by the gradual deposition of materials held in solution or mechanically suspended.

"Third. That along with the silt, mud, limestone, or other material thus deposited and forming strata, there were mingled the remains of various animals and vegetables—of shells, fish, and, occasionally, of terrestrial creatures, indicating—both by the vast number and variety, as well as by the almost perfect condition in which the shells, &c., remain—that the deposit must have been slow and regular, not the rapid and sudden effect of violence, or the tearing and destroying power of large waves in rapid motion.

"Fourthly and lastly. That the remains of animals thus found in the various strata differ, for the most part, in specific character; that as we examine those occurring in the lower beds, we find, gradually, a wider and wider departure from the existing forms, so that there is, absolutely, no instance of identification in the fossils belonging to any one stratum and those found in another, at some distance above or below it; and that there is a general resemblance between the fossils of each group indicating, apparently, successive creations of analogous

beings, who lived under nearly or exactly similar circumstances with those of some other group, situated above or below the former, but are not any of them referrible to the same species."

Bearing in mind these facts, it will be useful and important, in considering the value of a work like that of Mr. Murchison, to trace the circumstances which led to the discovery of "the Silurian System."

In travelling from East to West—that is, speaking Geologically, as we rise upon the dip, and cross, one after another, the bassetting edges of the rocks in the West of England, we reach successively those which are lower in position. For since the general inclination of the beds is towards the East, and different formations constantly present themselves in advancing westwards, it must necessarily happen that each different bed underlies the former one observed, and is therefore older than it. That this is the case is easily proved, and is well known as a general fact.

Now although, when thus simply stated, this is a matter easily understood, yet when it has to be applied practically in a district characterised by marks of mechanical disturbance from forces acting beneath the surface, as the whole of these old rocks are, the disturbances being of a nature utterly to mislead any one merely travelling hastily across the country—where, too, the argument from fossils is obscure, and the difficulty of identifying different parts of a group very great, it will require unwearied patience, a good Geological eye, and considerable practical knowledge to work out the detail, and form sound conclusions from facts apparently so conflicting.

Commencing, however, in Herefordshire, whose rich and fertile lands are characteristic of the "old red sandstone" (a group of coarse conglomerate with alternating beds of various substances, first described by our author as a system, and of which we shall have more to say hereafter), Mr. Murchison discovered in this formation several fossil shells and fish quite new to science. These, although rare, were yet abundantly sufficient to show that scarcely was there any resemblance between these organic remains and those of the carboniferous system of limestone, sandstone, and coal, of which it had till then been considered the lower part. Taking, then, the old red sandstone of Herefordshire and Scotland as a system of rocks subordinate to the carboniferous, he passed into Wales, into the country of the ancient "Siluri," and, marking carefully the termination of the conglomerate, he observed that a limestone made its appearance on the other or West side of it, at Ludlow, in Shropshire. This limestone lay evidently under the sandstones, and contained, as it fortunately

happened, abundance of fossils, referrible to species *all of them different* from those already known. It separated, therefore, the group to which they belonged from the carboniferous group, not only by the intervening stratum, whose thickness is estimated by Mr. Murchison at certainly not less than ten thousand feet, but also by a total change in the living beings of all kinds whose remains we meet with in the two deposits.

The beds thus observed at Ludlow do not by any means consist of pure limestone; there are abundant alternations of sandstone, which would formerly have been called grauwackè, together with shales or slaty beds. The whole extends for a distance of many miles into Pembrokeshire, and forms a group which attains a thickness of about a thousand feet. Throughout the various beds, fossils are found: they are peculiar and characteristic, and, once discovered and described, one is tempted to wonder how so very clear and unquestionable a phenomenon could have been so long before people's eyes without attracting attention and enquiry. So it is, however, with all discoveries. The more important they are, by so much the more are they usually simple and easily verified; and just as it was with advances in chemistry and those of astronomy, the application of a known principle or assumed law will always be the means of advancing science, when once the principle and the law are followed out to their legitimate consequences.

Continuing his researches, Mr. Murchison, in the course of innumerable traverses in all directions, and the most minute and careful examination of every circumstance occurring in these repeated journeyings, determined at length, that under this group of sandstone and limestone there occurred another, of which shales and limestone bands formed the chief part, possessing a total thickness of 1,800 feet, and the various beds of which it was made up being characterised by a very peculiar fossil belonging to a genus of crustaceous animals, no one species of which is now living to indicate the habits and habitation of this remarkable and long-lost creature. Below the group just described occurs a third, of still greater thickness, comprising a series of sandy flagstones with freestone, the flagstone being often highly calcareous, and sometimes alternating with fossiliferous limestone, the whole making up nearly four thousand feet of strata possessing their peculiar fossils in great abundance; and among them more than one very singular species of trilobites—that family of crustacea already alluded to.

The flagstones pass downwards into a succession of slaty rocks, with few organic remains, and those different from the Silurians, indicating a very extensive group of formations, for the most part changed by causes brought into action subsequently to

the deposition of the beds. These beds are most abundant in North Wales, and belong to the district examined, and to be hereafter described, by Professor Sedgwick, and called by him "*Cambrian*."

Such is an outline of the subdivisions of one great series of formations lying below the carboniferous rocks, and occupying a district which extends more than a hundred and fifty miles from S.W. to N.E., and is in some places thirty miles across. These formations are characterised, as we have said, by forms of animal remains totally different from any now existing, and nearly as widely removed from any similarity with carboniferous fossils. Until Mr. Murchison's attention and labour were directed to the work, the whole were totally undescribed, and not supposed by Geologists to possess any claim to interest.

Compared with more modern formations, the rocks of the Silurian system are certainly separated by a wide interval, both in appearance and reality, from any comparison or analogies we can institute. We cannot but suppose it possible that, at a period so remote and, as far as probabilities go, so early in the history of our globe, the conditions of existence *may* have been totally different. The temperature—the atmosphere—the relative extent of land and water—all these not only *may* have altered, but, from every fact known and every probability of the case, they *must* have become as we now see them by slow degrees and successive changes.

We must not, therefore, allow ourselves to look for very close analogies, or be surprised at differences which, instead of being really difficulties, are the strong support of all rational Geological theories. Bearing this in mind, let us consider the result of Mr. Murchison's labours in the quarry, and his account of the various animals by which the ancient seas, from which these rocks were deposited, must have been inhabited.

We say ancient *seas*, and in so speaking it might be supposed that we prejudged the question; but if so, it is a prejudication forced upon us by the innumerable facts which start up on all sides—by the vast masses of coral, the innumerable shells, the absence of any indication of fresh water, and the general nature of the *material* of which all these deposits consist.

That the various beds were, however, all, or for the most part, formed in an *open and deep sea*, is also contrary to probability. We have great reason to believe that at the present day no animals, or very few, live constantly at great depths of water, and that no very important deposit can be formed in such spots, owing to the small effect produced at such depths by disturbances on the surface. For these reasons, and assuming, as we have a right to do, that however the mode of action of

the great laws of nature might be varied, the laws themselves have undergone no change, we take it for granted that all highly fossiliferous beds were formed not very far from land of some kind, although it is to be remembered that a line of coral reef, or a system of coral islands in the course of formation, is as good for this purpose as a vast continent, with its rivers and extensive coast.

The nature of the remains one would expect to meet with in a marine deposit of considerable extent must always be scales, teeth, &c. of fishes; the shells of various molluscous animals; corals of various kinds; and the hard parts of crustacea, or animals allied to the crab, lobster, &c. Where there are abundant fossils, these animals must have existed, and it is by means of the remains thus found fossil that we are enabled to speculate on the former conditions of life. In the upper part of the Silurian system all such are accordingly found, and in large quantities; in the lower part, either from accident or because the animals did not exist, we meet with no remains of fish, while the shells, crustacea, and corals, are in sufficient abundance.

Since, then, in the upper Silurian we have portions of various animals, and since, by the advances which have been made in comparative anatomy within the last few years, a knowledge of the habits of animals can be acquired by an accurate and scientific examination of their hard parts, we are in a condition to learn what kind of inhabitants were possessors of our globe at so early a period of its existence, and thence what might have been the atmospheric conditions, and how far they differed from those at present known.

It must be noticed, as adding to the interest of this enquiry, that we are examining the *earliest known records*, so far as regards fishes and crustacea; for no remains of the former have been met with even in the lower Silurian rocks, and none of either in any formation beneath them. In proceeding with this research, the first thing that attracts attention is, that out of six genera to which the Silurian ichthyolites have been referred by the greatest living ichthyologist, M. Agassiz, *four* are entirely new to science, and wholly unlike anything in the overlying strata; while of the remaining two the *species* are totally dissimilar to any hitherto known, and, therefore, are confined to the carboniferous and lower formations.

There is a remarkable fact in regard to the natural history of fish which is sufficiently known, indeed, to Geologists, but which is worth mentioning here, as it serves to illustrate the conditions of the ancient seas. According to the arrangement of M. Agassiz, it appears that by far the larger proportion of fish now

living belong to the two of his four great subdivisions characterised by scales resembling those of the salmon and perch, while of the other two subdivisions—represented in our seas by the shark and sturgeon, and in some of the North American lakes by a fish called the bony pike—a very large proportion is known only from the fossil remains handed down in the various formations. As we advance downwards and examine the older rocks, the resemblance to recent forms becomes more and more distant, and, in the Silurian formations all the remains are referred to genera the most unlike any now existing, both in their anatomical structure, so far as it is known, and, in all probability, in their habits. It seems unquestionably true that the earliest races of animals were eminently carnivorous and voracious; for they belong always to the most entirely carnivorous types of the class to which they are referred, and appear to have possessed weapons of offence and defence which have to their more recent analogues become unnecessary.

However this may be, the parts of fishes discovered in the Silurian rock consist (1) of teeth: "some of them," says M. Agassiz (Murchison, p. 606), "bristled with sharp points, like the spurs of a cock, and belonging to fishes which were, without doubt, the pirates of the seas of that period;" (2) of a defensive fin, "whose lengthened, slender, and almost straight form, its imperceptible tapering away, the great size of the longitudinal ribs, and the depth of the alternating furrows, are traits which distinguish it at a first glance from every other species of this genus (*onchus*);" (3) of fragments of skin (shagreen) referred to an animal that M. Agassiz has thought fit to denominate by the rather terrible name *sphagodus* (slaughtering or murderous tooth); and (4) of coprolites, or the exuvæ of these fish, containing sometimes the remains of animals upon which they fed. We may conclude, therefore, that one of the earliest laws of organic existence that came into action was, that the balance of species should be preserved by the stronger preying upon the weaker, and so far the state of things then was the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as that which now exists.

As the fish characterising the Silurian formations bear no resemblance to those of our own time, we are, in like manner, unable usefully to compare the more highly organized molluscs; for they, too, are medals, whose legend is written in obscure hieroglyphics, and whose full meaning it has been as yet in vain attempted to discover. Still, however, the same general impression is produced. In our own time, the cuttlefish and other allied animals are remarkable, beyond all others of their class, for their predaceous and carnivorous propensities.

Possessed of machinery which grinds with extreme power the hard shells submitted to its action, it is known that an individual will often attack and conquer a crab of larger size than itself; and one may conclude that, with increased dimensions and proportionate weapons, the voracious propensities would hardly be diminished. When, however, we find that animals of this class inhabited the seas of the Silurian period, and attained to dimensions many times larger than any that have ever been seen recent,* we may feel the conclusion to which we before arrived much strengthened, and see additional reason to suppose that whatever change has taken place, it has been one of the application of laws, not of laws themselves.

Besides the shells of the highly organized molluscous animals allied to the cuttle-fish and nautilus of the present day, but referrible to genera long since extinct, we find that another great natural division of animals inhabiting shells—the *brachipoda* of naturalists, which is now represented only by a very few species of terebratulæ, met with in the West Indian seas—existed and flourished in these early ages to an extent utterly unparalleled by anything known in more recent times. Not less than five hundred species, many of them extremely abundant, have already been described as peculiar to various formations; and by very far the greater number of all fossil bivalve shells met with in the Silurian rocks belonged to animals of this highly carnivorous family. The number of vegetable feeders is extremely small, and everything seems to indicate a condition in which animals existed, almost to the exclusion of vegetables. The animals, too, it will be observed, although not belonging to those classes whose organization is most complicated, yet present to our notice types of the most complicated structure in the classes to which they are referred; and no such system as that of Lamarck's, of the progressive development of species, is at all borne out by the facts which force themselves upon our notice in these earliest formed strata.

But we have, as yet, only alluded to the fishes and shells: there remain to be considered the crustacea and corals. And here, among the former at least, we find yet wider departures from any existing type in the anomalous beings now so commonly known under the name of trilobites, and referred without

* It is mentioned, we believe, by Mr. Beale, in his interesting account of the sperm whale, that while searching for shells, he was attacked by an individual of this class, whose body was about the size of two fists, but which adhered so strongly, and made such violent efforts to get the arm he had seized within the grasp of its stony beaks, that without assistance Mr. B. would have hardly been able to escape. What must have been the power of one three or four times the size?

hesitation to crustacea. These seem to have been first described by our countryman, Lloyd, at the close of the 17th century: they were afterwards noticed by Linnæus, who considered them to be insects; and it was not till the year 1822 that any one attempted to give a systematic account of the numerous species which, up to that time, had been observed.

M. Brongniart, in a memoir dated that year, in the absence of any systematic knowledge of the older fossiliferous rocks, endeavoured to classify these remains, and gave a list of five genera and seventeen species; all of these, without any exception, seem to have become utterly annihilated before the strata of the carboniferous system had been entirely deposited; while most of them, both in number of species and individuals, and those, too, of the largest size and most remarkable forms, seem to have been confined to the much more ancient period of the Silurian formation.*

Dr. Buckland describes a trilobite as "composed of a large semicircular or crescent-shaped shield" covering the head, and provided with eyes, each eye in some species (*asaphus caudatus*) containing at least four hundred nearly spherical lenses fixed in separate compartments on the surface of the cornea. This shield is "succeeded by an abdomen or body, composed of numerous segments folding over each other like those of a lobster's tail, and generally divided by two longitudinal furrows into three ranges of lobes, from which the name trilobite is derived. Behind the body, in many species, is placed a triangular or semilunar tail, or post-abdomen, less distinctly lobated than the body."

One genus, the calymene, has the power of rolling itself up into a ball, like a common wood-louse, which, indeed, in general form the animal must have greatly resembled.

The eyes above alluded to, the supposed absence of any kind of feet, the peculiar trilobed form of the body, with its odd coriaceous margin, the power of rolling itself into a ball, and the non-existence of antennæ, are all circumstances which have attracted great attention to these remains; and many naturalists have exerted themselves to explain the singularities of structure and the probable habits of the animal. Dr. Buckland, in his interesting and valuable "Bridgewater Treatise," has made many very striking remarks, and brought together

* It is an interesting fact, that fossils, closely resembling trilobites, but approaching more nearly to existing types, have been lately discovered, associated with remains of insects and fresh-water molluscs, in part of the Wealden formation. When we consider that the most analogous forms are now met with in the seas of warm climates, we cannot but be struck with so remarkable an instance of the intercalation of a fresh-water species forming a connecting link between two marine ones.

much useful information, principally concerning the beautiful structure of the compound eye. He deduces the inference—natural, but highly important—that, “the waters wherein these trilobites maintained their existence could not have been that imaginary turbid and compound chaotic fluid, from the precipitates of which some Geologists suppose the materials of the earth’s surface to be derived; because such is the structure of these eyes, that any kind of fluid must have been pure and transparent, even at the bottom, in which *they* could have been efficient.” With regard to the atmosphere also, the Doctor observes, that any material difference from its actual condition would have been shown by a change in the structure of the organs on which the impression of rays of light was received: and we may fairly assume that the mutual relation of light to the eye, and the eye to light, must have been the same at the period of these primeval seas as at the present moment.

In addition to the information and opinions of other naturalists, Mr. Murchison has been enabled to offer a somewhat detailed account by Mr. Macleay, of the structure and affinities of these animals, and has, indeed, in this and other instances, given the stamp of authority to the Zoological as well as to his own Geological department. It will be interesting to the reader to hear the conclusions to which so eminent a naturalist of the invertebrata as Mr. Macleay has arrived. After a careful examination of the analogies which presented themselves to him, he concludes that—

“Though trilobites were to a certain degree sedentary, they must have had some power of crawling over a flat surface; but whether they moved by rudimentary, soft, or membranaceous feet, or whether it was by means of the undulation of setigerous segments, like the earthworm, or by wrinkling the under surface of the abdomen like a *Chiton*, are questions yet to be determined. One thing, moreover, is in my opinion clear, from their longitudinally trilobed form and lateral coriaceous margin—namely, that they had the power of adhering to a flat surface like a *Chiton*, *Bopyrus*, or *Coccus*. While thus sedentary, the hard, although thin, dorsal shell, probably saved them in some degree from the attacks of fishes, just as that of the *Chiton* protects such mollusca from all fishes except the *Scaridæ*.

“The trilobite probably (like oysters and other sedentary animals) adhered in masses one upon another, and thus formed those conglomerations of individuals which are so remarkable in certain rocks.”—*Murchison*, p. 669.

While the remains of Silurian fishes, mollusca, and articulata, are thus totally distinct from those of all newer formations, we find, on examining the remains handed down to us of animals whose organic structure is less complicated, and therefore, one

would suppose, less likely to be much affected by changes which more complete organization was too delicate to withstand—we find in the radiated animals and corals that the same fact obtains, and that here, as elsewhere, there is no identity of species in carboniferous and Silurian rocks.

Of the division of radiated animals, or zoophytes, there are two families represented in these ancient groups of strata, of one of which the living analogies are rarely seen, but which present to the Geologist forms as extraordinary, as varied, and as beautiful, as any to which reference could be made. The two genera of this family that are most remarkable, are the encrinite, or stone-lily, and the pentacrinite; and these occur most abundantly in various strata of the Oolitic period. Although, however, the more remarkable forms are not met with in the earliest formation, there occur in the mountain limestone forty distinct species, and in the Silurian rocks as many as fourteen, entirely different, some of them of great beauty and considerable size, but, on the whole, not so interesting as those which characterise more recently formed deposits.

Besides these crinoidea, there is a list of no less than sixty-five species of corals described also in Mr. Murchison's work, and figured with extreme care and accuracy, chiefly taken from the limestone of Wenlock, and belonging to the middle group of Silurian formations. The great abundance and often considerable size of the corals in this Wenlock formation is very striking, especially when combined with the fact that here, and here only, in the Silurian system, have been found remains of crinoidea sufficiently definite to be described; and that there is a comparative scarcity of other fossils, with the exception of certain species of brachiopoda and trilobites. From this series of limestones and argillaceous shale we may, perhaps, obtain a knowledge of the actual conditions of land and water at the time of their deposit; for it would seem to have required a considerable extent of shallow sea to account for so many animal remains, not indicating the existence of land or fresh-water species. Here, as in other ancient rocks, and as in the present seas of the southern hemisphere, there must have been numerous islands partly formed, and under favourable circumstances constantly and rapidly increasing, by the agency of the most laborious of nature's architects—the coral animal.

With regard to these coral formations, we cannot here do more than allude to their existence and extent, and refer in passing to the beautiful theory recently promulgated concerning them by Mr. Darwin; but it must not be lost sight of, as bearing upon this and all other questions of general Geological causation, that to

the animal in question—small and insignificant as its individual labours may seem—we owe a very considerable proportion of the solid materials of our globe: these, too, are materials which have been accumulating for countless ages—which still go on as they seem to have gone on since the first creation of animal life on our globe, and are still raising mountains in the deep seas, a perpetual monument, lasting while the world shall last, of the unnoticed and silent labours of the smallest of worms employed by the wise Governor of the world to counteract and balance the destroying agency of earthquakes and of torrents, of the violence of the storm, and the never-ceasing action of the desolating wave.

We have now seen what are the labours of Mr. Murchison described in the work referred to at the head of this article; we have seen that he commenced his researches on the western, or older extremity of a deposit of coarse sandstone, which characterises the greater part of the county of Hereford and parts of South Wales. This rock, called by Geologists the “old red sandstone,” was considered a good starting point, and *on the spot* was sufficiently definite; but it still remained to account for the fact that a bed of this kind, whose thickness is calculated to amount to ten thousand feet, and which is formed, to all appearance, by the violent action of waves or marine currents, should be, as it seemed to be, without its representative in other districts. The force of this reason will not, perhaps, be felt so immediately by the ungeological reader; but it must be remembered, that in all cases of a great effect being produced, as in Geology, by gradual accumulation, time must be considered as an element, and that during that same period, some other cause may and must have operated, produced a sensible, and, in some measure, a corresponding effect. Now the accumulation of ten thousand feet of strata, of whatever kind, and under whatever circumstances, must necessarily have required a very considerable time; and, granting all violent action that can be imagined in the seas adjoining what is now our island, the same violence could not have acted everywhere on the globe; for not only is there no evidence of its having happened, but there actually is evidence of its *not* having done so. All these causes combined, must, we say, make it evident that a highly interesting and most important question remained to be determined, viz.—in what part of England or Europe such other results of that Geological period might be seen? Where were the contemporaneous formations? What they contained in the way of fossils? And under what circumstances they also may prove to have been deposited? It fortunately happened, that the solution of these questions proved at length more satisfac-

tory than could have been at all expected, although not till after much laborious research (to an extent, indeed, hardly appreciable by any one not thoroughly acquainted with the practical work of Geology), and the exercise of a power of perspicuity in discovering the right way through a crowd of difficulties, which belongs only to the higher order of human intellect, and is characteristic of that original talent suggestive of discoveries which, once made, astonish every one by their simplicity. We now proceed to give some account of the progress of this discovery as the last great step which Geology has made, and one intimately connected with the promulgation of the Silurian system, both with regard to that system itself, and its ingenious and indefatigable author.

We have already, more than once, alluded to the Geographical position of the old red sandstone in the county of Herefordshire and part of South Wales. The same coarse conglomerate is met with wrapping round the igneous rocks of Scotland, and bursting through the carboniferous limestone of some parts of Ireland. South of the Bristol Channel, however, it does not appear; nor are any traces found of a rock of the same mineral character occurring in a shape that can be identified in any part of the continent of Europe.

Opposite to the Welsh coast, in Cornwall, and parts of Devonshire and West Somersetshire, the Geological structure, as well as the general appearance of the country, is indeed as completely different, to all appearance, from that of South Wales, as if the separation had been a wide ocean instead of a river channel. The predominant rocks met with consist of a very remarkable series, occurring also in many other parts of Europe, and known to Geologists by the German name *grauwacke*, sometimes anglicised into grey-wacke. This rock is generally dirty yellowish in colour; of various degrees of hardness, from a loose slaty texture to that of very hard stone, but generally splitting like slate, and alternating frequently with actual slate, which may be used for economic purposes. Numerous lumps rather than beds of limestone, sometimes crystalline, but sometimes fossiliferous, occur in particular districts; and it is not rare to find fossils in certain parts of the slaty or rather shaly formation, which is more immediately known as the *grauwacke* itself.

It is chiefly along the north and south coast of the peninsula formed by the three south-western counties of England, that the series called *grauwacke* is exhibited in this country. In the middle of Devonshire, and between the two coasts, there occurs a carbonaceous series, resting upon the *grauwacke*, as in a basin

or trough, and itself covered up in some places by the still more recent formation of the new red sandstone. In Dartmoor Forest, and along a line running west and south-west to the Land's End, there breaks out repeatedly a rock of igneous formation, the greater part of it being, in fact, granite, and containing, either in itself or its immediate neighbourhood, those veins of mineral riches which are so remarkable in Cornwall, and of such great value and interest.

We have thus, in the south-west of England, a district whose Geological features are an extensive carbonaceous deposit, sometimes overlaid by the new red sandstone, and resting immediately on a series of ancient rocks. These rocks are much altered by the immediate action of heat; are contorted and disturbed in every imaginable way, and only occasionally, and in particular spots, contain fossils which, when they do occur, are for the most part in bad condition, altered in appearance, and extremely obscure in every respect. It would be difficult to conceive a district offering greater obstacles to a satisfactory elucidation of its Geological character. There is in it no fair starting point: for the red sandstone is unconformable to the carbonaceous deposits which alternate sometimes with the grauwackè they rest upon; while this grauwackè itself is so doubtful in dip, and so interfered with by the igneous rocks, that it can only be taken as a base line in the absence of any other—not because it is either a desirable, or even tolerable one, for the purpose. It was, however, this district, and the labours of Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison therein, that solved the mystery with regard to the old red sandstone system, and first threw light upon one of the most difficult problems of Geology.

It is not necessary here to enlarge on the fact, that Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison were the real authors of this discovery; nor to do more than allude to the absence of such an acknowledgment in the work of great value and interest whose title is referred to at the head of this article. Mr. De la Beche felt, perhaps, some natural jealousy, that in a district where he had laboured much, and of which he had published an official map, strangers should come, and, proving his views incorrect, carry off the honours of discovery, where he had discovered nothing. He has, however, allowed himself, (see Note, p. 130.) to detract from the value of Professor Sedgwick's and Mr. Murchison's labours; and, to say the least, has most inconsiderately, and without sufficient enquiry, suggested that the Rev. D. Williams recorded observations to the same effect as those of the two Geologists alluded to, at a meeting of the British Association in 1835. This assertion was the cause of an article

appearing in the "Philosophical Magazine" for 1839, in which (see Note, p. 254) an unequivocal contradiction is given to the statement. We must refer to this article itself for an account of the controversy, trusting that every thing is now arranged. We are, at all events, perfectly convinced of what we have stated above concerning the real authorship of the discovery.

Mr. De la Beche's "Report" (the work in which the Note referred to appears) forms the first of a series of Reports on the Geology of England, published under the authority of the Ordnance Geological Survey, and accompanying a Geological map of the district, prepared also under the same superintendence. This series, if completed, will form an extremely detailed account of the Geology of England and Wales, of incalculable value to science, and giving a practical and national importance to the study of Geology, with a view to useful applications of it.

No man, perhaps, could be selected better calculated, on the whole, for this labour than Mr. De la Beche; and whether we regard his never-tiring energy, or his intimate acquaintance with all the practical applications of Geology to the arts of life, and earnest endeavours to bring every thing to bear at once to some useful economic purpose, it is a matter greatly to be rejoiced in, that he was the Geologist selected for the occasion. It is not without great regret that we have felt it necessary to point out his certainly unfair and blameable attack—for it was such—on Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison.

Let us return now to the various rocks of Devonshire and Cornwall, and the discovery of the order of their superposition. So lately as 1836 it was the general opinion among Geologists that the *grauwackè* already described was a rock of the highest antiquity, by some even considered as primitive; and Mr. De la Beche himself thought that the carbonaceous deposits could not be separated from it. In the summer of that year the two Geologists we have so often referred to were "naturally anxious," as they express themselves, "to apply to this county (Devonshire) those principles of classification by which the successive subdivisions of the Silurian, and also of the Cambrian system, had been determined; for it seemed to us very anomalous that the culm (carbonaceous) beds of Devonshire, though stated to resemble those of the coal field of Pembrokeshire, both in their mineral characters and in their associated fossil plants, should be interpolated amongst the most ancient *grauwackè* rocks of the county."

The first result of these labours was that which we have already had occasion to speak of as the groundwork of Mr. De la Beche's attack—the discovery, viz., of the fact, that the car-

bonaceous beds were not mixed with the older rocks, but lying upon them, as in a trough; and that this part of the series, at all events, did belong to the great carboniferous system of England, and was the equivalent of the true coal measures.

At the time when this was announced there was no further advance attempted towards determining the real age of the grauwackè itself. Subsequently to the memoir on this subject being read, Mr. Weaver, having examined the neighbourhood of Barnstaple, confirmed the new views with regard to the carbonaceous beds, and reported them to be unconformable to the lower, and, therefore, older rocks. To verify this, Professor Sedgwick, in the summer of 1838, proceeded to the district once more, and found, contrary to his expectations, that there was *no* discordance in the junction south of Barnstaple: on the contrary, the culmiferous deposits seemed rather to be a continuous uninterrupted series following the older rocks. The conclusion thus arrived at proves one of two things; either that the culm must be older, or the grauwackè much less ancient than was thought. The question then became one to be determined only by the evidence of fossils, and as by this time there had been large collections of fossils accumulated by various persons, and the subject was thus capable of being sufficiently investigated, there was nothing to be done but to make a careful examination and comparison of all the organic remains that occurred in these rocks.

This, however, was a work of no ordinary labour, and required the careful attention of a naturalist well accustomed to examine the minute distinctions still remaining even in crushed and distorted shells; and this, too, in cases where for the most part there is great difficulty in deciding, even with every advantage of collateral knowledge. It is, indeed, almost impossible for the general reader to imagine the hours and days of diligent examination and repeated comparison in this department of the naturalist's labours. In forms of life, where the organization is very complete and highly complicated, the specific character is strongly marked, and may be traced generally, more or less, throughout, in connection with the known wants and habits of the animal. A certain projection in a bone corresponds to certain arrangements of the muscles, which have immediate relation to the important and vital functions. Often one single bone is sufficient, in the hands of a comparative anatomist, to point, with no doubtful indication, to the whole history of the animal. When, however, we are deprived of these aids, and in order to decide upon a species have only the shell, or still less, the coral, that a molluscous animal or zoophyte has once inhabited—when

we find that a small difference of form does *not* indicate always a real difference of animal—when alterations in the mode of growth, in the temperature, or depth, or the effect of accident, often alter the whole external character of the hard parts; then, indeed, does it become necessary to labour long and carefully, to compare every thing, to note every thing; to compare, not individuals only, but groups; and to take, as it were, a mental average of the points of real importance in the differences that may be observed. Such, and even far more difficult, is the labour of the naturalist who takes for his subject the animals of low organization; and such knowledge is absolutely essential for the purpose of determining, in a case like the one in question, the relative Geological age of a great formation. This knowledge is happily to be found among more than one of our countrymen, and to Professor Phillips and Mr. Lonsdale the fossils of Devonshire and Cornwall were referred for examination and comparison.

It would be utterly inconsistent with the object of this article to go over, in detail, the evidence by which the two naturalists above-mentioned were brought to the conclusion that the fossils in question contained some species in common with those of the carboniferous system, and some identical with Silurian types; that, in fact, they were intermediate in character between the two, and would indicate, therefore, a deposit of intermediate age. Such was the general result—a result at which Mr. Lonsdale was the first to arrive, and which induced him, in the early part of 1838, to suggest the idea of a Devonian system, contemporaneous with the old red sandstone; as the only means to escape from the difficulties in which the fossils seemed to involve him, presenting, as they did, some species not to be distinguished from certain of the very few animal remains met with in the old red sandstone itself.

At the time when Mr. Lonsdale threw out this hint, Professor Sedgwick had not, as yet, made that accurate and careful examination of the actual superposition of the strata which ultimately led him, as we have already mentioned, to the conclusion that the carbonaceous series passed gradually and imperceptibly into the Devonian *grauwacke*.

This was the work of the summer of the same year, 1838, and his labour then—the additional and careful examination of the fossils already seen by Mr. Lonsdale, and many others then first examined—led to the conclusion that all must belong to a system intermediate between the two great systems (the Silurian and carboniferous), which had been before shown by Mr. Murchison, in his "*Silurian System*," to be entirely separated

from each other, both by their order of superposition and their imbedded organic remains.

Such, then, was the nature and such the groundwork of that great and important step of modern Geology—the acknowledgment of the Devonian system as contemporaneous with the old red sandstone. Contrary to all appearance by which, in accordance with what is observed in other rocks of similar mineral character, the Devonian and Cornish fossiliferous rocks would rank as transition, and be identified with the very oldest secondary deposits, we find them now classed as contemporaneous with a group of coarse conglomerates almost without fossils, and chiefly remarkable for its vast and almost incredible extent and the heterogeneity of its nature. We find Devonian strata possessed of every character of altered rocks, with the calcareous portions developed rather in lumps than beds—associated with slates, sometimes crystalline—intersected by innumerable dykes and veins of trap, and with fossils sufficiently rare to allow of one writer, at all events, considering the whole as actually formed at the same time as the granite itself, and by igneous agency. Under all these remarkable circumstances, it certainly must be considered a great triumph of ingenuity, and a discovery of no ordinary importance, to sweep away so many incongruities and difficulties, and explain all in harmony with the other known facts of Geology, making use of this apparent exception to prove, with still greater accumulation of proof, the general law, and turning, thus, a case of acknowledged difficulty into a real *experimentum crucis*, not only explaining all the difficulties, but adding strength to the chain of reasoning upon which the science of Geology itself is founded.

The Silurian and Devonian systems thus proposed as separate groups of fossiliferous strata in the British islands, it was natural that those, who had with so great labour worked them out here, should anxiously look for a verification of their theories in other countries, and endeavour to prove that wherever these ancient formations existed, they were capable of subdivision and classification in a manner more or less analogous.

Accordingly, no sooner had Messrs. Sedgwick and Murchison completed their investigations in England, and embodied in a tangible form the conclusions to which they had arrived by an examination of the structure of their native country, than they turned their attention to that part of the continent of Europe where the more ancient formations appear at the surface, and resolved to examine the so-called *grauwacke* of Germany, and the numerous transition rocks occurring in the neighbourhood of the mountain districts of the Hartz, the Fichtelgebirge, the

Taunus, the Hunsrück, and the Eifel. In the prosecution of this object they spent the summer of 1839, and the results of their journey were communicated to the Geological Society, and so to the scientific world, in the spring of this year.

The success of their expedition, was, on the whole, as great, and the conclusions as interesting, as the well-known talents and intimate knowledge of the subject possessed by such distinguished men would prepare us to expect.

A very large proportion of the *grauwacke*, which till then was all considered as contemporaneous, and of the age of the oldest transition rocks, has now been satisfactorily shown, both by the evidence of superposition and fossils, to belong to the Devonian system, and to be immediately inferior in position, to the carboniferous limestones, with their well-known and highly characteristic fossils.

It was also found that, in the west of Germany and Belgium, there was a regular sequence downwards, through the Devonian into Silurian rocks, although, from peculiar circumstances connected with the elevation of that district, the beds are often contorted and disturbed to an extent almost inconceivable, and sometimes for miles together are fairly turned upside down, the ones last formed lying under the more ancient beds. The extraordinary complication and confusion incident upon disturbances of this nature, had rendered it, indeed, almost impossible for any one, only acquainted with the continental beds, to arrive at a just conclusion; and the knowledge derived from the examination of the superposition in England was required, in order that any rational explanation could be given. This knowledge, however, had been acquired; and once more England served as an index map to Europe, explaining, by a simpler example, what was there inextricable confusion, and giving, as it were, the key, by the proper use of which the stores of knowledge were to be distributed. The general result of the expedition was, therefore, so far satisfactory, as confirming the theory of an extensive fossiliferous formation intermediate between the Silurian and Devonian systems; and there is, thus, a safe line of departure for continental Geologists, and a step taken towards the much required work of classifying the numerous "transition rocks" which it has hitherto been the practice abroad to consider as one great and inseparable group.

The fossils of the Devonian system are not, on the whole, of such popular interest, or characterised by so many new and striking forms, as are presented by those of the Silurian rocks. In the old red sandstone, both of England and Scotland, we find, indeed, a fish of very remarkable form, and altogether

the most striking, in every respect, of the fossils of the formation. This singular animal, called by M. Agassiz "*Cephalaspis*," or buckler-headed, from the extraordinary shield which covers the head, and which has often been mistaken for a trilobite, is described at some length, and with great accuracy of detail, in the work of Mr. Murchison, and we gladly extract a portion of this interesting notice, as taken from a part of the work to which we have not hitherto alluded. The peculiar interest of this fossil consists in its being a link, added to those we already possess in trilobites, connecting the fishes with crustacea, (or animals like the crab and lobster, covered with a hard jointed coat), and uniting yet more intimately, and with unexpected resemblances, two great natural divisions, which, at the present day, do not graduate so insensibly into each other:—

"The head of this fish is very large in proportion to the body, and occupies nearly one-third of its whole length. The outline is rounded in the form of a crescent, the lateral horns inclining slightly towards each other, while the interior and central parts project much. These lateral prolongations are, in fact, less distant from each other than they are from the round part of the snout. The middle of the head, including the region of the eyes, is elevated; the eyes are placed in the middle of the shield, and near each other; they appear to have been directed straight upwards—at least, such is their position in the specimens best preserved, and which are completely extended in their natural state: between them, and in front of the orbits, there is a triangular depression, which appears to have been occupied by the nostrils. The posterior and middle portion of the head is nearly square, and is edged by the first series of scales; whilst the sides are very much sloped, and form the interior border of the lateral prolongations of the disc of the head. The exterior surface of the head is, in a great measure, covered by irregular scales, in form approaching to circular, the edges of which, notwithstanding they are more or less straight, are united in juxta-position, so as to form a pavement of scales: these scales are bony, and their exterior surface enamelled; each of them has a convex centre, and hollow furrows diverging towards the edge; their form varies extremely—the greater part are circular, but some are angular; the latter are attached to the straight edge of a scale, which on other sides is circular, and here and there small ones are seen filling up the intervals between the larger. The bones of the head have a fibrous structure, which is most clearly observable on the internal surface of the disc, but is also seen in places where the scales are removed. On the interior part of the disc the osseous fibres are directed straight forward, on the sides they are oblique, afterwards transverse, and lastly, in the lateral prolongations of the crescents of the head, they follow the direction of these prominent parts, and appear in general to diverge to every point from the sides of the cranium.

"The heads of these fishes are frequently found detached from the bodies: the reason of this may probably be the great difference which

exists in the structure of these two parts, and, above all, in the disproportion of their dimensions and forms, which would offer a distinct resistance to the pressure to which the animals must have been exposed. The body most resembles that of certain fishes of the family *lepidoides*, but differs considerably in the position of the fins, and the singular scales with which it is covered. Its form is that of an elongated spindle, swelling out on the anterior parts and narrowing insensibly to the end of the tail, which is proportionately very slender, since its diameter does not exceed a quarter of the width of the body, near the nape of the neck.

"The scales of the body are of very peculiar form, and quite unlike those of any other genera. On each side there is only one range of plates, high and narrow, inserted transversely in the middle of the sides, whilst on the edge of the back and the belly there are series of little scales, disposed obliquely to the extremities of those on the sides. The analogies in the structure of the scales appears to confirm the position assigned to the *Qonoidonts* and *Siluroids*, in the order *Ganoids* following the *accipensers* or sturgeons. The exterior surface of these scales is ornamented with undulated furrows, disposed in the direction of their greatest diameter."

This description relates chiefly to a beautiful and nearly perfect specimen in the possession of Mr. Lyell; other species are remarkable for a still greater departure from the general form of fishes.

Of *Cephalaspis Lloydii*, M. Agassiz remarks—

"Of the four species, this is the one the head of which, at first sight, least resembles that of a fish. In the specimens where the superior surface is preserved, it is difficult to divest oneself of the idea that these fossils are the shells of some molluscous animal; for so completely regular are the striae, that they perfectly resemble the lines of growth of the testacea.

"In conclusion, M. Agassiz remarks that the structure of the head in this genus resembles singularly that of the shell of crustaceans, which possess also an exterior coloured layer, under which is found a layer of a granular structure; and then a layer of lamellar structure; and it was not without long deliberation that I decided on considering several specimens as the heads of cephalaspis, rather than the scales of some unknown crustacean."—*Murchison, p. 589.*

We have quoted this long and accurate description, partly because it has relation to one of the most extraordinary forms of animal life with which the researches of Geology have made us acquainted, and partly, also, as an instance of the beautiful clearness and perspicuity with which most of the new genera described in Mr. Murchison's work are defined and explained. Technical language must, of course, be employed in such minute description, but the general idea is given with great force and accuracy, and without any unnecessary use of scientific terms.

Besides this remarkable genus of fishes, the fauna of the

Devonian system presents not very much of popular interest. We have, indeed, the goniatites of the mountain limestone displaced by a new form of the ammonite, simpler in the walls of separation than any other form, and having the siphuncle on the inner instead of the outer margin of the shell, thus increasing the links in this interesting, and now rare, family. In the beds of Devonshire there occur abundance of shells allied to the terebratula, a few univalves, and many corals. These most of them differ from the shells and corals both of the mountain limestone and Silurian; although out of a list of twenty-eight shells referred to by Mr. Murchison as met with in the new red sandstone, as many as seven are identified with Silurian species. The fossils of the whole system are, however, described and figured in a recent part of the transactions of the Geological Society, where the able memoir on this subject, by Messrs. Sedgwick and Murchison, will stand as a lasting record of their great and important discovery.

Before concluding, we wish to make a few remarks on "the Report," to which we have already referred, and the object of which we have already, in a few words, declared.

The great advantage of a work like this of Mr. De la Beche's is to mark down at a given moment the actual Geological condition of a district—to state the opinion formed after a sufficiently careful and minute survey with regard to the stratification, the superposition of rocks, the nature of the various deposits, their extent, and the advantages derived or injuries suffered, by their being as they are found to be. Just as in geography, a map of an unknown district is the first step to improvement, and however imperfect, will soon lead to more accurate knowledge; or, as in any science, to have the limits of knowledge and ignorance, or error, definitely drawn, is a great step towards advance in that science—so, in Geology, the publication of a report, professing to embody the details of Geological knowledge of an important district, cannot but do good, if it only draws attention to the very faults of the work. Geologists are well aware what a great step was gained when the first volume of the Geology of England and Wales was published by Messrs. Conybeare and Philips: not that the work was perfect or sufficient, but it enabled people to see where observation was wanted; where mistakes had been made; and where, above all, certain facts might be shown: this is of itself a great step; and if the effect of the Ordnance Geological survey were merely to collect and put on record the scattered knowledge hitherto accumulated by the efforts of private individuals, even then a great benefit might be hoped for and good be fairly anticipated to accrue to science.

But much more has been attempted, and, so far as the work has proceeded, much, very much more has been done. By the appointment of Mr. De la Beche and a surveying staff to assist him—by the personal examination of a good Geologist, aided by authority and power, we have obtained not merely an abstract of what was known already with regard to the interesting district of the South-West of England, but a useful addition to that knowledge in the economic details connected with it.

As bearing upon the immediate subject of this article, the Report, indeed, is not quite so satisfactory as could be wished. Mr. De la Beche may have laboured much, but others have been more successful; and we have not been able to make so much use of his work as if our object had been the elucidation of some other branches of Geological science. There is, however, much valuable detail even in this department, and some ingenious speculative enquiry concerning the possible nature and position of the land of those early periods, and the cause and circumstances of the accumulation of the carbonaceous series.

Not contented, however, with the evidence of fossils with regard to the age of this carbonaceous series, and unwilling, it would seem, to give up entirely all his preconceived opinions, our author, (see chap. v. containing a "general view of the carbonaceous rocks of the district,") brings forward many authorities and employs much argument to prove, if possible, that in the carboniferous deposits of the most ancient date, the fossils are identical, or nearly so, with those of the mountain limestone series. Whether the explanation of this apparent anomaly be not generally to be sought for in a reference to the Devonian system, we will not now stop to enquire. Certainly the fact that the carbonaceous rocks of Devonshire pass insensibly into the Devonian system, and the carboniferous formations of Wales in a somewhat similar manner into the old red sandstone, would indicate that here, at all events, the evidence of superposition is in favour of the two being identical, and, according to the conclusion that Professor Sedgwick has come to, that the "coal measures" themselves are really represented in Devonshire: this, however, is a point to which Mr. De la Beche would seem to attach some importance, though under the circumstances there appears to us but little ground for discussion. The separation of two systems from the older rocks, and the changes of classification in Geology thus introduced, is, beyond all doubt, a subject of the greatest importance to science, and in its consideration are involved several points of interest. Among them there is, however, one

of which we have not as yet said much ; but which is worthy of careful attention and consideration : we allude to the extensive range of the same species of fossils in the older rocks, and the assumed persistence and even re-appearance of certain species of shells and crustacea.

There has long been a feeling among Geologists, even the most eminent, that the evidence of fossils is not alone sufficient to classify in Geology, and the possibility has been suggested, that in those early periods when, to all appearance, the creation of animals upon our globe was yet recent, there might have been causes in operation which, through a long series of ages and during the accumulation of vast thicknesses of strata, would produce certain species at one time, and then, after an apparent cessation of their existence, might cause them to appear again.

That in all rocks of more recent periods such a phenomenon appears *not* to have happened—that, so far as we know from accurate and definite knowledge, there is no instance of the same species having ever been re-created, and that so exuberant is the creative power that, in our own seas, we frequently find analogous forms, but never identical species indigenous in two districts, either of land or water, widely separated by natural barriers. All this, it is true, does not amount to positive argument against such an hypothesis, or, at least, only to an argument of small weight. It is, however, an undeniable fact, that this idea has been gradually giving way before the advance of definite Geological and Zoological knowledge ; and that whenever the actual work of field Geology has been fairly undertaken, the results have always hitherto been such as to strengthen our dependence on fossils, and weaken the influence that mere mineral character might have on our decision.

This is eminently the case in each of the two systems before us, and we find as marked a distinction in the general character of the organic remains of each of these two new groups as occurs in the case of any of the principal subdivisions of the secondary rocks. We are willing to acknowledge that even yet there is much doubt with regard to certain species ; but it seems to us that the *prima facie* improbability is so great of any interference in a law which, being first grounded on observed facts, all subsequent experience has tended to verify, that we look with great caution upon evidence tending to invalidate it. When, moreover, this evidence is doubtful in character, and, as in many cases, not capable of the accuracy of investigation which is absolutely essential to decide positively on a specific form, we must be allowed to hesitate long before giving way to the belief that

it is only in more recent formations that fossils are absolutely characteristic.

The Devonian and Silurian systems, too, while they tend much to prove that it is only safe, even in these early formations, to look to organic remains for the subdivisions of classification, point out yet more clearly the total inadequacy of mineral structure to give any correct and definite notion on this important point. Let it not be forgotten, that so long as mineral structure was allowed to influence the Geologist in judging of the age of the rocks of Devonshire and Cornwall, not only was no approximation made towards any useful and true result, but the wildest hypotheses were indulged in, and the most unphilosophical views promulgated and received. The mere occurrence of roofing-slate in the district under consideration, was supposed to stamp it at once as contemporaneous with the slate rocks of North Wales, of Cumberland, and of various parts of Germany. The granite was declared primitive; and, in one remarkable case, in spite of direct evidence to the contrary occurring at every turn, the granite, the killas or clay-slate of Cornwall, and the numerous bands of fossiliferous limestone of that county, were all ranked together as the various parts of one great miscellaneous formation. It was the examination of fossils which first excited the attention of those distinguished Geologists whose labours we have been tracing. It was the careful comparison of fossils that first gave the hint upon which the superstructure of the Devonian system was erected; and it was the conclusions arrived at by the Geological Naturalist, and not by the Mineralogical Geologist, that ultimately decided the question, and gave a convincing and crowning proof of the reality of the existence of such a system. We desire not, indeed, to elevate the Naturalist at the expense of the Geologist, for his office is not and cannot be, so far as Geology is concerned, the principal one. His deductions are of the utmost importance, but they are so only when in the hands, and under the guidance, of the field Geologist. In this position his labours are invaluable; and the greater the advance that has been made hitherto in Geology, the more important, the more conclusive, and the more satisfactory, has his assistance been found, and the more useful have his suggestions and decisions proved.

On this subject Mr. Murchison and Mr. De la Beche are a little at variance; and as it is one of very great interest at the present time, we have been tempted to say more than by some, perhaps, may seem required. So much, however, depends on the due admission of zoological evidence in Geology, and on the

division of labour necessary to have this evidence in its most useful and complete form, that we think it may do good to have laid the matter before our readers.

The labours of Geologists among these older rocks have received a great impulse by the exertions of which we have been endeavouring to record the principal results; but the work yet to be done is scarcely of less importance, and will employ all the energies, both of the discoverers themselves and their successors, for many years, to fill up the description, of which, as yet, we have only the outline and the great distinguishing features. At this time Mr. Murchison is in Russia, pursuing there his researches into the older rocks, and carrying out the principles he has discovered and laid down in England. Professor Sedgwick has been labouring for years on the rocks of North Wales and Cumberland, which would appear to form groups yet earlier than those of Siluria and the South-West of England; while Mr. De la Beche is proceeding with the work of the Geological survey in South Wales, and will doubtless, in due time, give to the public another volume of interesting and important economic detail. All are proceeding steadily and incessantly in advancing the interests of science; and it is most gratifying to find that, in Geology at all events, and in this our land, each is labouring, so far as can be judged of, in the department in which he is likely to be most useful; and each has a clear and definite object in view, to attain which the energies of his life are well spent.

In this way, Geology has advanced, and must advance. By discussion, open, fearless, and unreserved—by untiring efforts to produce the evidence of facts in support of theory—and to depend on facts only for a confirmation of theory—and with all the earnestness, without *much* of the anger, of disputation these are the causes which have acted powerfully in giving to Geology the prominent and striking position it now occupies among the natural sciences. While these causes continue to act, and at present, at all events, there seems no reason to anticipate any alteration, the advance must continue; and we may confidently expect that every year will add more and more to the accuracy of Geological knowledge, and bring us nearer to that greatest of all desiderata in science—a simple, comprehensive, and universally applicable theory, which shall embrace all known facts, and be the means of adding numberless others equally interesting and all harmonious.

ART. IV. *A Glossary of Terms used in Grecian, Roman, Italian, and Gothic Architecture.* The Third Edition, enlarged; explained by seven hundred wood-cuts. 2 vols. Oxford: J. H. Parker; London: C. Tilt, Fleet-street. 1840.

2. *Illustrations of Monumental Brasses.* No. 1. Printed for the Cambridge Camden Society. Cambridge: Stevenson.

3. *Ancient Models: containing some Remarks on Church Building.* Addressed to the Laity by CHARLES ANDERSON, Esq. London: Burns. 1840.

WE congratulate the lovers of Architecture in general, and of Ecclesiastical Architecture in particular, on the appearance of works which put them in possession, at a very moderate cost, of so excellent a compendium of information on that interesting and important science, accompanied by so large an assemblage of illustrations, taken from the best and purest models, of its minutest terms and distinctions.

Interesting and important we should consider this study at all times, and that not merely to professed architects, but to every person of liberal education, every one who has time at command, and whose station may entitle him to give an opinion on works of public utility or ornament. But how much are its interest and importance enhanced, by the present aspect of affairs, especially of Church affairs, in almost every town and village of the land.

It is about twenty years since a zealous divine and antiquary, no less anxious for the welfare of his own and succeeding generations, than acute in his investigation of the past, spoke thus despondingly on the subject of Church-building:—

“What are the requirements for a new church? That it cover the smallest possible space, be constructed of the meanest materials, be consigned to the lowest bidder, and paid for by rates wrung out of the tenantry. Neither can this miserable necessity be avoided. Every thing is now on the rack.”

In ancient days—

“While men’s wills were more prompt, their wants were fewer, and, therefore, they had some superfluity of labour to bestow, where our farmers and peasantry have none.”

And as to the higher classes—

“What lord of a parish has ready money to bestow on a work of disinterested bounty? It is anticipated in that emulation of luxury and expense which is now become universal.

“If he has no money, ask him for wood; but cast an eye over his domain, and see whether his ancestors’ oaks, if yet surviving the oppo-

site but united perils of rapacity and waste, do not bear the 'nigrum theta' of a valuer's scribe?

"If he have a quarry upon his estate, and the stone be unsaleable, perchance he may allow it to be wrought for the new fabric, on condition that an adequate compensation be paid for trespass. With respect, however, to conveyance, racers and even coach-horses are not to be strained by labour, to which their muscles are so little adapted.

"There is, certainly, a period of science and improvement in human society, too far advanced either for disinterestedness or imagination. At that period, by the unwearied exertions of the present generation, we have unhappily arrived. All abstract science, all the arts of life, have indeed reached a point of perfection beyond what could have been foreseen in any earlier age; but that point has been attained at an expense which makes the purchase dear.

"Calculation has rendered us cold and selfish, and tasteless. But selfishness is often the handmaid of profusion; and that minute economy which modern habits have the peculiar felicity of uniting with great expense, leaves no heart for works of devotion and charity."*

This was said in no anti-aristocratic spirit; the feelings and habits of the writer leaning all in the opposite direction; and as to the disposition of the manufacturing population towards church-building, the same writer complained, in a discourse expressly designed to awaken public attention to the lamentable destitution of the opulent and extensive manufacturing district around him, that, from the Reformation downward, while the population had increased ten-fold, but six additional churches had been provided, making a total of thirty to 100,000 souls, and but one solitary, small, and unadorned chapel, in that portion of it, and during that period, in which the increase of population had been most rapid and overwhelming.

How happy a change are we now permitted to behold! a change to which these strong representations, and others of a like character, not a little contributed; and of which their authors lived long enough to rejoice in the commencement, though the tide, we believe, is still but rising, and will be long before it reaches the flood.

On every side, new churches present themselves to the view of the traveller, not only in crowded towns, but in the most rural and secluded hamlets. All classes of the community have at length awoken to a sense of their duty to God and their country. The landlord has felt and acted on the old paternal impulse to provide for the spiritual wants of his tenantry; the manufacturer has acknowledged the like obligation to his numerous dependents; frequently the good work has been set on

* Dr. T. D. Whitaker's *History of Richmondshire*, vol. i. pp. 6, 7.

foot at the pressing instance of persons in humble circumstances, who have urged on those of superior station or influence the duty of taking up their cause, and have placed their contributions unasked in their hands; and we could point to individuals who, without any ambition of attaining so honourable a distinction, have, simply by availing themselves of existing opportunities, and now directing, now following, the desires and endeavours of others, become entitled to the dignity of founders of churches, to a greater extent than has probably been the lot of any who have preceded them, since the first ages of Christianity in Britain.*

In the very district to which allusion has been made, the churches already erected or in progress, will nearly double the number existing at the period of gloom and despondence; and the interesting accounts of consecrations and preparatory ceremonies, with such ocular demonstration as a short journey in almost any direction may supply, will suffice to satisfy the most incurious observer that the process is general. Indeed, this new feature in our scenery, forces itself on the most unwilling and prejudiced eyes, and rising up at the precise moment when it was the fashion to speak of the Church of England as a structure crumbling to pieces almost without a touch, and when some of the parasitic sects, to which too much credit has been given for their *adherence* to it, were very pleasantly putting forth their plans for supplying its place, is worth a thousand arguments in its defence, a thousand parliamentary securities for its maintenance as the religion of the country.

Many of these structures are highly creditable to the taste and skill of the architects, and worthy of the purest ages of the styles which they profess to imitate; but this is more, we fear, than can be said of the majority; and the general result of this great movement in church-building, the greatest, we believe, since the Norman conquest, if not since British church-building began, is more to the honour of our resuscitated zeal, than our architectural talent. Nor can the remark be limited to the ecclesiastical branch of the art. Who can look on the splendid public or private mansions which for some time gave cause for the reproach, that while dwelling in "ceiled houses," and adorning them with every enrichment that wealth could purchase or ingenuity discover, we allowed the house of God to

* The heralds assign a chevron as the armorial distinction of a builder of a church or mansion, and three of these honourable ordinaries are sometimes found interlaced in ancient shields: had some of our friends their due, their Majesties of Benet's Hill would have to devise means of interlacing six or seven, if not more, of these badges in their coat-armour.

lie waste, without lamenting that so large a portion of this lavish outlay, was absolutely thrown away, even with reference to the inferior object at which it aimed ; and that, between tameness and mediocrity of conception, and the most absurd incongruity of arrangement, there should commonly be little to regret, when the caprice which rears these costly piles demolishes its own creation, or accident, or innate instability, forbids the architecture of the nineteenth century, to tell its tale of shame to the twentieth. Even when the highest public encouragement, both in the shape of distinction and emolument, was proposed to the restorers of our Houses of Parliament, what, after the designs of Barry, Buckler, and one or two other architects of eminence, did it produce, but German stadthouses, oriental divans, and nondescript trash, which the Hall of Rufus, and the Church of the Plantagenets and Tudors—

“ —Where brass has learned to breathe,
And stone, like dew-drops on Arachne's web,
Looks lightly down on bannered stalls beneath—”

would have beheld in their neighbourhood with ineffable disdain.

Confining our attention, however, for the present, to church building, with the exceptions already made, including the splendid restorations in several of our cathedrals, what can be more evident than that a noble opportunity for the display of national taste, had it been in existence, or at least in a state of general diffusion, has been, in a great measure, lost? We have no longer, indeed, churches, and those in the immediate vicinity of noble mansions, distinguished no otherwise from the humblest meeting-houses, than by an attempt at a cupola for the bell ; the design considerably inferior in ornament to that of the stables ; and owing what little of decoration it has, to the fact of its being, as to its upper member, an *object* among the trees of the park ; it is one of the hopeful signs of the times, that something of external comeliness befitting the dignity of a National Establishment, is assigned, as a matter of course, to the humblest of our ecclesiastical edifices : but, in defining the character of that comeliness, how far have we deviated from the lines of grace and beauty, as well as from every ancient example ! Even in the metropolis and its immediate vicinity, the eye is astounded by forms, which no terms of architecture as yet invented, Grecian, Roman, Italian, or Gothic, can describe ; and, should we be disposed to search among the diminutive *esques*, Grotesque will be the nearest approximation the most fertile imagination can supply. In those parts of the country where church-building is most general, the fanciful theory would seem

fully borne out, which derives the distinctive features of national architecture from certain peculiarities in the habits or localities of the builders. Thus, as Egyptian architecture is said to owe its origin to the cave, Chinese to the Tartar tent, Gothic to the interlaced branches and foliage of the German forests, many of the new churches in the manufacturing districts, exhibit towers which are an evident modification of the factory chimney, while the structures themselves have no less evident an affinity to the mill or the print-shop. Every where we have a strange jumbling of the ornaments of different periods; and members or appendages of the sacred building, in situations which, to an eye accustomed to ancient models, can only render them distortions and deformities.—Gothic designs, with roofs, pediments, and other important features, of purest Grecian elevation; towers, surmounting the chancel at the east, or compelling it to retire, with its furniture, to the west; fonts, instead of their due station near the entrance of the church, thrust in wherever a nook happens to present itself, which cannot well afford space or convenience for a sitting; pulpits, which when churches taught by their very form, held a modest but commanding situation between the font and the altar, either totally concealing the altar or occupying its accustomed place, as if the preacher were the object of worship, or his ministrations the sole purpose of attendance; exteriors overlaid with gorgeous ornaments, to harmonize with utter nakedness within; meagre mouldings; spires and pinnacles, unadorned with crocket, finial, or fillet, and seeming destined to impale any future Vulcan or Ajax who may become obnoxious to celestial ire; or offending as fatally in the opposite extreme, and by their cumbersome proportions and enrichments, surmounting penthouse-like projections in the battlements and upper stories, threatening to press down the structures prematurely to the dust, which they should elevate a step towards heaven by their chastened lightness.

Nor has much been done to remedy these evils by the architectural guides, who have hitherto exercised most sway amongst us. We have models and plans of cheap churches, which have contributed to propagate some of the worst of these deformities through whole districts. One of the newest claimants of popular attention, would give us layers of arches, by which the triforia of cathedrals may be made to serve the purpose of galleries, in buildings otherwise of the conventicle order, at the slight sacrifice of all subordination of height and breadth between the successive strata of columns and arches, in order that the triforia, which are thus advanced from a very secondary

station to the most prominent one, may not mount too far aloft for sight and sound of the preacher. And we fear that the regulations of one of our most important church-building societies must bear the blame of a very common, but most unsightly sort of roof, by which the timbers, usually as bare of ornament as those of a barn or warehouse, are made to cut off the heads of the arches below, and despoil the general design of whatever beauty it may originally have possessed. In no point, perhaps, does the combination of strength and grace in ancient construction present a more painful contrast to modern doings than in this, the sure expectation of which, as the crowning act of a committee by whom the funds are to be made up, and the plans consequently decided on, is sufficient to dishearten the most zealous examiner, in the discrimination between minor details of comeliness and ugliness, where all must be levelled at the last.

The general complaint of professed architects, when these and similar deviations from architectural propriety are pointed out, is, that they are crippled in their designs by the scantiness of the funds afforded them: and, indeed, since the lamentable deficiency of Church accommodation throughout the country has been laid open, considerations of so much greater importance than the mere gratification of taste, have pressed upon the almoners both of public and private benevolence, that we might well have allowed much weight to this plea, had not the offence been about equal on the side of exuberant and incongruous ornament, where the means have happened to be abundant, and the architect unfettered, as was frequently the case at the commencement of the church-building movement.

But, whether for better or worse, a large proportion of our rising churches, as well as schools and other buildings connected with them, are not likely to fall into the hands of professed architects, at least those of high and established reputation. The squire, or his lady, has some knowledge of architectural design, and the same local interest which prompts his liberality to lay out the site, and contribute largely, if not exclusively, to the cost of the erection, suggests the desire that it should be a memorial of his taste and skill, no less than his goodwill to his neighbours. The clergyman, as in ancient days, thinks it not unbecoming his calling to give the plan on which the material stones shall be arranged, which are to prove, he trusts, hereafter, the outwork of a spiritual temple; and some of the most successful imitations of the old styles which have fallen under our notice, owe their origin to this natural impulse

of a cultivated and active mind. In these cases, some experienced builder of the neighbourhood, who scarce aspires to the title of architect, is called to counsel and aid in the work of construction; in others, he is responsible alike for design and execution; in all, or most, the task of deciding on plans and designs, at least in the first instance, devolves on persons not architects by education or profession, but occupied in the general walks of life.

It is for these reasons that we rejoice in the appearance of works like those before us, which tend to make the distinctive characters of the various styles of architecture, especially those most in use amongst ourselves, familiar to persons thus occupied, so as to enable them to decide at once, and almost intuitively, what ornaments are appropriate to a particular style or period, and what it would necessarily reject. We rejoice to see talents and opportunities of investigation like those possessed by Professors Whewell and Willis, and skill like that of Mr. Blore, Mr. Rickman, Mr. Williment, and others, occupying the very first place in their respective professions, combined, as they are in these volumes, with the most praiseworthy liberality, in the endeavour to render intelligible and interesting to the general reader those subjects which their own works have already recommended to the admiration of the scientific and learned. We fully agree in the wish expressed (Glossary p. 98) that some knowledge of Church Architecture were more general among the clergy and other functionaries immediately concerned in the care of our ecclesiastical fabrics, and though it might be going to far to make it "*an essential part of clerical education*," and would certainly require something of supernatural foresight to render it that of "*a rural dean or archdeacon*," as there suggested, we should undoubtedly, as parents, in anticipation of the arrival of our offspring at these dignities, nay of our possibly having a boy-bishop in training, do our best to encourage a propensity for spending the holidays in church—(not *steeple*) hunting—the delight of our own boyhood, and the source of inexhaustible pleasures in after life.

We the rather add the *episcopal* to the other official dignitaries, whom it would be desirable, if possible, to educate in the principles of Church Architecture, because we have learned to dread the personal inspection of our older parish churches, which has been undertaken by some of our venerable diocesans, as a sort of crusade against screens, stalls, pews which deviate a little from the line of uniformity in the aisle, or perhaps retain an oaken knob which lifts its horn a little too high above the heads of its fellows, with other nameless remnants of antiquity, which we have been accustomed to venerate almost equally with the episcopal office itself.

The ancient ecclesiastical styles of our own country, rather than classical models, seem generally to have commended themselves to modern adoption; and indeed, except in situations where façades of Grecian or Roman buildings form the prominent objects to the eye, there is every thing to justify the preference. Our climate, and the character of our scenery, are not favourable to open colonnades or to flat lines of building, which can only admit the elevation of a tower, or any approach to a spire, by a violation of classical propriety. The mental associations connected with these styles and their appropriate ornaments, are all on the side of heathen rather than Christian worship. And we are almost barbarians enough to add, that there is a sameness and monotony about them, in comparison with the endless variety of what is called Gothic Architecture, for which no correctness of proportion, or chasteness of outline, can compensate.

We are indeed sometimes told, that the Grecian, Roman, and their derivatives, are the only appropriate styles, for the worship of the Church of England; that it cannot suitably occupy the spacious minster, or even the unmutilated members and compartments of an ancient parish church; that it should betake itself to chapels such as that of Greenwich Hospital, or some of our colleges, which furnish beautiful specimens of the Palladian or revived classical orders. But this is said by persons who would much rather it were banished from the world—persons who affect to make the date of our Church and worship contemporaneous with the revival of the classical style in the sixteenth century, and, strangely overlooking the debasement of Gothic Architecture in countries where Romanism has remained undisturbed, and that from a period considerably anterior to the Protestant Reformation, would charge on the authors of that great revival of *Primitive Christianity* the decline of architectural taste, and especially of those beautiful forms of Church Architecture which distinguish the middle ages. We carry the date of our Church and our worship far higher; to times when Roman prelates pronounced anathemas on the claimants of the title and authority of Universal Bishop which their successors have since usurped; when men still held venerable by the Church of Rome, protested against image worship, and preached against purgatory and transubstantiation; and indeed, to still higher periods of British and Saxon Christianity, when these and other novelties of the modern Church of Rome, were as yet uninvented. We cannot therefore consent to regard our cathedrals and other ancient religious edifices, as exclusively appropriate to modes of faith and worship with which their first founders would have as

little sympathized as ourselves. We cannot concede that it is the peculiar dictate of *Romanism*, to consecrate the highest efforts of art to the honour of Almighty God. Without images, relics, processions, or altars, except to the one living and true God, and the one Mediator whom He hath appointed, occasions present themselves in which our cathedrals still attract the presence, and unite the adorations of "the great congregation" for whose use they were designed; and in these, or the humbler edifices, which form the beauty and glory of the land, it requires but to enter into the spirit of our services, derived as they are from the earliest and purest ages, to perceive how exquisitely they harmonize with all around them.

It is this harmony of association, this idea of continuity and unbroken succession, which forms the great charm of our ancient Ecclesiastical Architecture; and, permitted as we still are to enjoy it, in most of our country towns and villages, and not unfrequently within a very short distance of the metropolis and other crowded haunts of men, we know no greater gratification to the taste and imagination, as well as those loftier emotions of which they are but the handmaids. Approach one of these venerable sanctuaries a little secluded from the general mass of human habitations, yet not so much so as to interfere with the comfort of its attendants. Accompany them through its shaded avenue, to the porch where, for ages, the more early or distant worshippers have found shelter and refreshment. Enter, and be reminded by the successive objects which meet your eye, as you proceed from the porch to the chancel (for we suppose font, reading-desk, pulpit, altar-table, and the other appendages of worship, to be in their original positions), that you have entered God's spiritual house by baptism, and that its immediate ordinances and instructions are designed to conduct you to the highest acts of communion with Him which his Church on earth can afford, as the prelude to still nobler worship in his heavenly temple. Then, accompanied by your fellow Christians of every rank and age, unite in the solemn services which have been handed down to you by apostles, prophets, martyrs, and confessors—and we know not what is wanting in the accessories of devotion, to raise its influence on the mind to the highest pitch of intense yet chastened fervour. If there be any thing to bring to view the distinctions of rank and office, it is only that example in the higher, may have its due effect on the humbler order of attendants. If the efforts of human art at all engage attention at such a moment, beyond the general effect of external dignity and solemnity in softening and exalting the spirit, their natural tendency must be to remind us how many generations have joined in the same acts of

adoration, and contributed, as they had opportunity, to the honour of the same Saviour, who have now passed away. And the memorials of the departed, within and around the pile, the cumbent effigies of knight and dame, the presbyter with uplifted hands engraved in brass on the lowly floor, the mural monuments of various fashion and device, the arms and forms of benefactors in the many-coloured panes which spread a seemly mantle over all, appear to bring those departed generations to view, and surround us with another congregation among whom we must soon be actually numbered. They once occupied the same stations in society with ourselves, passed through the same changing scenes of life, held the same place in the house of God, though none perhaps with equal advantages, and their silent and prostrate forms, add weight to the voice of the living preacher, admonishing us that of all these things an account is to be rendered and may soon be demanded, and that—"to whom much is given, of them will the more be required."—We must have leave to think that these accompaniments of worship, whether in cathedrals or parish churches, are not *weakened*, but greatly heightened, in effect, by the circumstance that the worship they accompany is conducted in a language which can be understood by the congregation, and attended by no scenic representations which go to materialize their conceptions of the true object of worship, if not to partition amongst rival claimants the homage which is His alone.

Another and kindred ground of attraction to the ancient styles is their *historical* as well as religious associations. They are intertwined with our attachments to the soil, as well as with our aspirations above it. Our older churches mark the periods, and are often closely connected with the record, of important national events; they contain the trophies and the ashes of our national or local worthies; and have a sort of indigenuous right to our regards, especially in situations where these traditionary records are rife, such as no other forms of architecture, however beautiful, can possess. We can hardly conceive a more grievous violation, a more grating jar to the heart-strings, than ours were doomed to sustain, on the first discovery that a Grecian oratory had displaced the old parish church erected on their enchanting demesne by—

"Rokeby's lords of martial fame,"

a race ennobled by genuine English virtues long before they found a minstrel to immortalize them in song. Nor was the injury amended by the fact, that the new temple was in excellent keeping with the mansion of the modern lord's, and was itself a handsome structure, beautified with the sculpture of

Nollekens and Westmacott, and with a tripod-shaped font designed by the classic hand of the poet Mason. The present worthy proprietor, of whom it is but justice to say that he is in no way responsible for the outrage, must regard it, we should think, so far as the simple question of taste is concerned, as he would the factory which has intruded itself at Tivoli.

But, without any aid from mental association, the intrinsic beauties of our ancient Ecclesiastical Architecture, in all its varieties, are such as amply to recommend them to modern imitation. In each, are to be found most perfect models, adapted to every scale of dimension and cost which the wishes or means of our church-builders can desire; and, while we fully concur in the recommendation of an eminent prelate, whose diocese has furnished him with the best means of practical experience in the matter, that those benevolent individuals who design the erection of a church, should look around them and consider what ancient edifice comes nearest their wants and views, we wish they were furnished, in this Glossary or some similar work, with a good selection of ancient examples of entire churches, from which a better chance might be afforded them of choosing aright, than may always be attainable in their immediate neighbourhood.* An introductory sketch of the origin and progress of the successive styles, somewhat enlarged from the notices which incidentally occur in the preface to the Glossary, p. iv., seems also desirable, as a clue to the series of terms and more ample explanations which follow in alphabetical order. Nor are we quite satisfied with the terms, which, after Mr. Rickman's nomenclature, have been adopted in this volume as in most general use. The title of "*decorative*" is far from directing us to the style which most abounds in decoration; that of *horizontal* would serve quite as well as "*perpendicular*," to indicate the transition from curvilinear to rectilinear tracery;—and it is the peculiar infelicity of pointed architecture, that the generic name by which it is most commonly known, and which it would now seem almost hopeless to efface, has its origin either in utter ignorance or undeserved contempt. The Gothic hordes, who are sometimes fabled to have brought it from their woods and forests, had forsaken them, and for above 700 years followed the fashions of the more civilized people whom they subdued before the Pointed arch appeared; and, whoever may

* This is partly done by the excellent little work called "*Ancient Models*," which, as far as it goes, we can cordially recommend: the remarks introduced are very valuable, and the selection of models judicious, but it is not large enough for the purpose.

finally take the merit of that admirable discovery, the Goths have assuredly as little to do with it as the Greeks.

Few subjects of inquiry are more interesting than the origin and progress of Ecclesiastical Architecture, independently of any local associations or causes of temporary attraction.

In tracing the assemblies of the Christian Church from the "upper room" at Jerusalem, where the disciples are first found after our Lord's Ascension, to the edifices of loftier or humbler pretension, where we now find them in all regions of the earth, we are forcibly reminded of the prophetic illustration adopted by its divine Head—that it should be cast into the earth as a grain of mustard-seed, the least of all seeds: but grow up and spread forth its branches, till it should become the greatest of trees, and overshadow all lands. After the chamber, in which, with closed doors, its first solemnities were observed; and the houses and schools, in which the apostles taught, as convenience might dictate, when as yet no settled habitation could be obtained for the infant community; we discover it taking refuge in the catacombs at Rome, where memorials still remain both of its worship and worshippers; and doubtless, "dens and caves of the earth," would quite as frequently as human abodes, bear witness to the celebration of its rites, in those days of violence and persecution. As soon however as an approach to settlement was made—and indeed in the intervals of persecution, we have, as might be expected, evident tokens of a disposition on the part of Christians, to provide some permanent place of resort for the public exercise of their religion—before the close of the first century, we hear of mansions relinquished by their liberal-minded owners for this purpose; then, of oratories expressly erected for the objects of Christian worship, which Tertullian, at the end of the second century, thus describes: "The house of our dove-like religion is simple, built on high and in open view, loving the light as the figure of the Holy Spirit, and the East as the representation of Christ." A.D. 222, we hear of a church built at Rome by Calistus the bishop, and A.D. 239, of another at Næocæsarea, which remained unhurt when many public buildings of that city were thrown down by earthquakes; and about the same time the Christians seem in general to have been encouraged, by a long cessation of injury, to aim at a degree of architectural splendour in their religious edifices which marked them out for special destruction under Diocletian and Galerius, before whose eyes the Church of Nicomedia, which occupied a lofty site and was visible from the palace, was demolished by their soldiers as the signal of universal devastation, in the year 303.

It would be vain to inquire minutely into the architectural features of these early Christian temples.

The atrium, with its surrounding offices, in a Roman villa, or the corresponding arrangements in an oriental residence, would furnish no unlikely model for the future cathedral and its accompaniments, before it became safe to imitate a public building. Afterwards, the basilicæ or halls of justice, gave both form and name to the early Christian churches, and were preferred as models of construction to the existing temples, as less associated with the impurities of pagan worship; though days less scrupulous too soon arrived, in which not only were the advantages of a site and structure already set apart to sacred uses, deemed sufficient, as they naturally might be, to overcome such scruples, on the abandonment of idolatrous rites, but the idols themselves were allowed to retain their places, baptized by Christian names, and the external rites of Christianity were assimilated as nearly as possible to those of paganism, so as to shock but little the feelings or prejudices of the uninquiring convert.

The basilica however is the ordinary and established model of the Christian temple, and Mr. Willis (*Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages*, pl. i. figs. 1, 4) has given us sections of a Roman hall and a Florentine church, which strikingly exhibit the affinity. We thus derive the oblong form, the porch or galilee, the division of the body of the building or nave into a centre and side aisles separated by columns, the elevation of the eastern portion, where was the tribunal in the civil basilicæ, as the choir for divine service in the ecclesiastical, the introduction of cancelli, or a latticed screen, between this and the lower portion of the structure; and finally, the semicircular termination or apse, at the East end, where sat the dispenser of civil justice, as afterwards the administrator of the higher offices of religion, declaring from the altar the Divine law, and admitting to, or excluding from the privileges of Christian communion. Appendages may also be traced at the sides of the basilicæ, set apart for the hearing of inferior causes, consultations, or other business connected with judicial proceedings, from which it is easy to deduce the origin of side chapels, and not very difficult to suppose, that the early fondness of the Christians for the form of the cross, would cause the building to branch out into the striking and beautiful variation of transepts.

The earliest accounts which have reached us of the form of Christian churches do not represent them as materially different from many which may still be seen amongst us. Eusebius

describes the church of Tyre as containing an outer and inner portico, a nave, two side-aisles, a choir separated by a cancelli, and a semicircular apse. (Eccl. Hist., book x. chap. 3, 4). The roofs of the larger churches, in the days of Constantine, seem from the same high authority, to have been of cedar, covered with tiles, perhaps of gilt brass; and the walls, columns, and pavements, to have been adorned with variegated marbles. They doubtless partook of the generally gorgeous, but debased character of Roman Architecture, in the declining ages of the empire, and cannot be better described than in the words of Mr. Willis:—

“The great Christian churches erected at Rome, under the patronage of Constantine and his successors, shew but too plainly the deplorable state of architecture in the West. They are, to be sure, large and lofty, but consist of parallel ranges of columns, of different orders, adapted without skill from the destroyed temples, and sustaining upon arches, walls of disproportionate height, covered with open wooden roofs; the whole bearing every mark of ignorance and neglect of rules.

“In the districts remote from Rome, another process of architectural change was going on. Here the ravages of the Barbarians swept away the ancient rules altogether, and left only the shattered examples; and here we find that after they had settled themselves in their conquests, their builders, working as unschooled imitators, copied the construction of these ruins, and employed their materials, using the fragments of decoration, but naturally placing them so as to be entirely subservient to the actual construction of the building. Where new ornaments were required they imitated the old ones, or invented others. In this way were formed the various styles of the ages preceding the eleventh century—the German and French Romanesque, the Lombard, Saxon, Norman, Saracen, and others, all of which have features differing entirely from those by which the Byzantine and Christian Roman are separated from their common origin, and all of which exhibit more or less of a barbarous and rude character.”—*Arch. of Middle Ages*, pp. 18, 19.

Rude however as it is, compared with the primitive and classical models, the architecture thus diffused over so wide a range of territory, and extending its influence during the first thousand years of the Christian period, lacked not features of its own to recommend it; but, in the hands of bold and original architects, threw off much of its imitative character, and in the various countries which have been named, not only assumed strong marks of local and national distinction, but made vigorous efforts towards the recovery of that elegance, which had well nigh disappeared from the later Roman and Byzantine models.

In our own country, architectural antiquaries have long been in dispute as to the distinctive features, if there be any, of Saxon and Norman buildings, agreeing, as they confessedly do, in the

common property of the semicircular arch, buttresses of very slight projection, and a resemblance more or less close in mouldings, capitals, and minute ornaments, to the debased Roman Architecture from which they were derived.

The high authorities cited in the works before us, have not yet given definitive sentence on this question, nor are we curious to pry deeply into the mystery. Our home attachments dispose us to cling with all eagerness and tenacity to any fragment which looks like a relic of early Christianity; and it might be difficult to arouse our scepticism to a pitch which would lead us absolutely to reject the possibility of our possessing a church of native British origin among the sands of Cornwall, or a Britanno-Roman structure on the cliffs of Kent. We venerate the remnants of Roman brick-work at St. Martin's, Canterbury, St. Alban's, and other churches, which connect the revival of Christianity by Augustine and his companions, with the memorials of its earlier triumphs; and never listen to the Saxon missionaries with so attentive and delighted ears, as when they point their converts to the deserted British churches, and bid them re-enter, and restore them to the worship of God. The cathedral at Canterbury, as well as the church of St. Martin, is said to have been erected by St. Augustine *where an old Roman church had stood*; and as the first propagators of the Gospel amongst us, had planted the cross on sites before occupied by the altars of heathenism, there is evident proof that its restorers, wherever it was practicable, rejoiced to trace out the footsteps of their predecessors, and rebuild on their foundations. As to their own doings, every degree of additional light which is thrown on this interesting portion of our history, to which we are happy to see so large and close attention directed, tends to rescue the Saxons from the imputation of utter barbarism, so superciliously thrown on them by Milton, and, after his bad example, by later historians. What we know of their liberality and devotion, with the descriptions handed down to us by contemporaneous writers, of churches and church-ornaments, and above all, the constant intercourse with other nations, and those the most enlightened of their time, kept up by their most acute and accomplished men, the friends of munificent princes, themselves both architects and authors, equally prepared "*aut scribenda agere aut legenda scribere,*" forbid the notion that their works are only distinguishable from those of the Normans, if distinguishable at all, by their rusticity and meanness. Doubtless in these, as in later days, there were differences both of taste, science, and resources, which would lead to corresponding differences in the buildings which were reared; but a comparison of documentary evidence with existing remains would

favour the conclusion that, at Ely, and elsewhere (See Miller's History of Ely, pp. 119-122), we have erections which date far back in Saxon times, but are little distinguishable in form or construction from those which belong to a late period of the Norman dynasty; and loath should we be to abandon the pleasing persuasion, that Jarrow may yet retain a tower which looked down on the devotions of the venerable Bede; that the cell of Cedda may yet be paced at Lastingham; that Wilfred's "church of polished stone, with columns and porches variously ornamented," has not utterly perished at Ripon; and that the structures as well as libraries of York, may retain memorials of the illustrious Alcuin, the friend of Charlemagne, which fire cannot consume, nor age devour.

The notion has been strangely entertained and propagated, that the Saxons built only, or chiefly, of wood; but, though the splendid piles both of York and Durham arose from such humble beginnings, and the "*ecclesia lignea*," not unfrequently noticed in Domesday, is still to be met with of earlier or later date, stone churches almost immediately superseded the original erections, at both the above-named cities; the former, in the days of Paulinus the first Saxon archbishop, who also witnessed the erection of a church of stone at Lincoln. Wilfred, archbishop in 670, whose work at Ripon has been already noticed, skilfully roofed the cathedral at York with lead, and glazed it throughout, besides presenting to the altar of the church which bears his name, a splendid covering of purple and gold, a copy of the Gospels written in letters of gold on parchment richly illuminated, having the cover inlaid with gold and precious stones, and various sacred utensils of a style but ill according with the idea of extreme rusticity. Benedict Biscop, a few years later, "brought skilful masons and artificers from France," to erect his monastery of Monk Wearmouth; and in 782, besides presents surpassing even those of Wilfred to the mother church, we have an account of a new church built at York by the celebrated Alcuin and Eanbald, under the direction of Archbishop Aldhelm, which had "a lofty arched roof supported on strong columns, and several porches making, with their various projections, a pleasing variety of light and shade." Nor was Alcuin the only man of eminence in Saxon times, who united the highest reputation for general learning, with architectural taste and skill. Grimbald, one of Alfred's first professors at Oxford, is supposed to have left memorials of his abilities as a builder, in St. Peter's and Christ Church in that city, as well as in Winchester cathedral. Indeed, it seems to have been customary for the Bishops of those days, to take with them in their

pastoral visitations, a company of masons, joiners, plumbers, and glaziers, who might be occupied, as occasion should offer, in ecclesiastical erections; nor was the designing and superintending such erections deemed unworthy the attention of their most promising chaplains and scholars.—(Rev. E. Churton's *Early English Church*, p. 87, &c. &c.)

Under such auspices, we know not what should entitle the Normans to their proud claim of architectural pre-eminence, or why it should be thought impossible, in spite of existing appearances and written testimony most strongly confirmatory of the fact, that buildings of very considerable elegance, bearing the same general features with the Norman, derived from their common parent the later Roman architecture, may date very early in Saxon times.

The earliest specimens of Ecclesiastical Architecture amongst us, and those in which the indications of Saxon are supposed to be most decidedly distinguishable from those of Norman workmanship, are churches in which “a sort of rude balustre, in place of a straight mullion or small pillar, supports the semicircular arches of the windows; a peculiar sort of quoins is seen at the angles, consisting alternately of long and short stones bonding into the wall; Roman bricks are occasionally used; and buttresses are wanting.” The chapel of St. Martin, within Dover Castle which, if not altogether of Roman construction, was, like its namesake at Canterbury, a deserted Roman church, re-occupied and in part rebuilt, at the earliest period of Saxon Christianity, retains some of these features; and they are decidedly marked at Barton-on-Humber, where St. Chad is known to have erected a church before 672, at Monk's Wearmouth, where we have already seen that Benedict Bishop constructed a monastery at about the same period, and many other churches enumerated in p. 187 of the Glossary before us.

The claim of this class of buildings to precedence, is confirmed by their general resemblance in form and ornaments to the earliest derivatives from the declining Roman Architecture which are known to exist abroad: but during the whole reign of the semicircular arch, whether in Saxon or Norman times, and even during the earlier period of the styles which succeeded it, we have imitations more or less close of the Corinthian capital and other classical ornaments.

If, with several of our antiquaries who have not been surpassed in zeal, architectural skill, or powers of discrimination, we ascribe existing portions of Malmesbury Abbey church to as early a date as 675, of St. Alban's to 798, and Peterborough and Ram-

sey to 970, we must be content to pass from the seventh to the twelfth century, with few or no landmarks to define the productions of one age from those of another. After the exchange of the balustrade for the column, and the dismissal of rustic quoinstones for plain masonry at the angles, with the adoption of a buttress very slightly projecting in place of an unbroken line of wall, we know of nothing beyond the very uncertain criteria of a greater or less degree of ornament, greater mass or lightness of proportion, greater rudeness or finish of workmanship, and other adventitious circumstances, which, in the absence of historical data, can be offered as grounds of conjecture, whether a building belong to the section of this long interval which preceded the Norman conquest, or to that which followed it. The Saxon abbey of Ramsey, built about a century before the conquest, was cruciform, with two towers, one at the centre of the cross supported on columns and arches, the other at the west-end, not differing therefore, in form, from the cathedrals and larger churches which are known to belong to the Norman period. In these also we have great varieties of proportion and design, exuberance or chasteness of ornament: in general, however, it may be remarked, that the later or Norman period of semicircular architecture abounded in enrichments of every form and device, about the principal arches and mouldings, and especially those of the doorways, the gorgeous sculpture of which has frequently secured their preservation, when the rest of the structure has perished. The cathedrals of Durham, Peterborough, Rochester, and many others, furnish beautiful specimens of this style in its later stages and loftier efforts. Iffley, near Oxford, and Adel, near Leeds, are instances of high enrichment and all its peculiar features, in churches of inferior order; and the country abounds with unpretending structures, whose low square towers, narrow round-headed windows, and semicircular chancels, separated from the body of the church by a bold arch which may almost vie with the porch in the exhibition of the billet, zigzag, hatched, and cable mouldings, bear evident tokens of Norman if not Saxon antiquity.

The long repose of the arch in a semicircular form was however at length destined to be disturbed, by a succession of changes as rapid as those which broke in on the Roman empire, whose fall it had so long survived.

During the twelfth century and as has generally been supposed from the early part of it, though in our Glossary the change is not dated earlier than 1175, the Pointed arch is found intermingled with the semicircular one, in buildings otherwise bearing the same general features with those of the preceding period,

and contending for the mastery till at length it entirely superseded its ancient and venerable predecessor, about the year 1220.

The origin of this new and most beautiful feature in Ecclesiastical Architecture, must be left, like the boundary line between its Saxon and Norman precursors, in abeyance. Mr. Willis disproves the theory of Mr. Whewell, which considered it a necessary consequence of the requirements of vaulting, without substituting anything of his own, beyond a conjecture, that it is of oriental parentage, and was introduced into Europe by the crusaders.

For ourselves, we are not inclined to seek a foreign and Paynim origin for this meek but mighty usurper. We are disposed to acquiesce in the opinion, that, like the art of printing and other agents of extensive change and improvement, its rudiments had long lain close at hand, and so obvious as it might seem in their application, that the marvel only is, to those who live after the discovery, that they were so long unobserved and unemployed. Here and there a solitary specimen of this arch is found in Roman as well as Oriental Architecture, as at Pompeii and in the aqueducts of Trojan. Intersecting circular arches, afterwards so common an ornament of Norman buildings, occur on a coin of Edward the Elder, A.D. 900, and the occasional perforation of the parts intersected, for the formation of windows, of which also we have instances in Norman edifices, at once produced the form itself, in a capacity for use as well as ornament, and gave a hint for its further application.

Though we cannot be so unjust to our Saxon forefathers as to attribute to their conquerors all that is a little raised above rusticity in the remaining monuments of our early national architecture, we may admit that the adventurous and versatile Normans were more likely to improve on such a hint, and carry it out to its utmost extent; at all events, the result, after much beauty and grace from the combination or rivalry of the arches during the period of transition in the twelfth century, was the prevalence, during the thirteenth, of a style unequalled for the combination of simplicity and elegance. The column, which had been gradually shooting upwards, from the heavy Norman or Saxon mass of masonry whose circumference sometimes exceeded its height, became now a graceful pillar, surrounded by slender shafts, often of variegated marble, detached from it except at intervals, where they are united by moulded bands, and at the base and capital forming one body with the central stem, and branching above into rich and diversified foliage; the windows assumed the lancet form, and were disposed singly or in

combination at the sides, and in rows of three or five at the extremities of the building, separated from each other by the same light and elegant shafts, and again united above by arches bearing the characteristic flower or tooth-moulding which belongs almost exclusively to this period; the buttresses were increased in projection and, surmounted by high pediments, those at the angles terminating in pinnacles, with light crockets and finials; and to crown all, the low Norman tower, whose roof when rising to a point, scarce attained an elevation which made it visible above the parapet, now soared aloft, and sustaining an ornamented spire, the very perfection of symmetry and beauty. Everything of the cumbrous and massy was here thrown off for ease and lightness; the roofs were high pitched, the arches acutely pointed, and all the features of the design had an upward direction, and an abhorrence of the obtuse or even the right angle in their elevation, which strikingly distinguishes them from Classical Architecture in all its gradations, and too frequently from modern imitations, in which the approximation of the Early English pediment to Greek or Roman proportions, is sure to offend the eye as an irredeemable deformity.

It is scarcely necessary to name Salisbury, and the north transept of York cathedrals, as exquisite specimens of this style; the Temple church in London; Englefield, Berks; and many village churches throughout the country, also exhibit its very marked and peculiar features, which are deservedly in high estimation with the church-builders of the present day.

Like other revolutions, however, which have unsettled and overturned the work of many generations, the beautiful creations of the pointed arch were destined to rise and disappear in quick succession, and a century, instead of a thousand years, usually serves to date the reign of its most interesting varieties.

Before the end of the thirteenth century, the extreme lightness and simplicity of what is called Early English Architecture, had begun to be lost in a more full and flowing, but still chaste and elegant style of decoration, like the spring charms of opening youth, growing up to maturity, and merged in the loveliness of its summer hour. The long lancet windows, which in their separation were sometimes found to diminish the strength of the structure, now began to be collected under one arch, the head of which, at first plain, or but slightly ornamented, was soon filled with tracery, the chief peculiarity of which, and indeed the distinguishing feature of the style, is its *curvilinear* character, displaying itself in an endless variety of wavy and leaf-like forms. The detached shafts, which also were frequently found too slight and slender for strength, were united with the central

column; and the alternations of concave and convex surfaces thus introduced, were accompanied by corresponding variations in the mouldings of the arches and groin-work of the roofs, which still however, while admitting more richness and variety of form and ornament, retained the general character of grace and ease which had belonged to the former period. This also is the commencing point of niches and tabernacle work, with lofty triangular canopies or ogee arches; the windows are adorned with stained glass, in which, as well as on the walls, the devices of heraldry begin to contribute their exhaustless stores to the pictorial enrichment, no less than the historical interest of the building; and the lancet-heads in the lower lights admit at first a slight curvature within, terminating in a leaf or other ornament which may be called the bud of the cusp, and afterwards several small arches, or sections of arches, which thenceforward became a regular member of the design. The Decorated style—for thus is the architecture of this period distinguished by Mr. Rickman—maintained its sway during the greater part of the fourteenth century, and has left beautiful specimens of its influence, in Lichfield Cathedral, parts of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Chapter-house and west front of York Minster. It well deserves to be regarded as the climax of Pointed architecture, in which the utmost that could be desired, both in strength and ornament, was attained, without any sacrifice of elegance or grace. It is to be regretted that the costliness of its decorations, though not precluding their adoption in numberless instances by the “rude forefathers” of our villages and hamlets, is now deemed almost an absolute prohibition to their introduction even in the most opulent neighbourhoods. Nothing can surpass the pleasing distribution of light and shade from its ramified windows which are usually seen to the west, through an open arch between the tower and the body, as well as to the east of the building; nor is it possible to conceive of models more worthy of imitation for their symmetry of proportion, and general comeliness and chasteness of design, than are commonly to be found in the churches of this period.

Were we called on for examples which should at once distinguish the leading features of this style, from those of the Perpendicular; which next follows, we should direct the eye of the spectator, from the great *west* window of York Minster, to the greater, but certainly less beautiful window, at the *east* end of that noble pile (the former bearing date between 1291 and 1330, the latter between 1361 and 1373); first however, as in duty bound, congratulating both him and ourselves, that by something little short of miracle; these splendid works have

been preserved for our inspection, from two successive fires, which brought down the blazing beams and rafters of the building, within a few inches of their delicate tracery.

The former, exhibits all the graceful and flowing curves of the Decorated style, in full perfection, in its upper compartments, with the undivided lights handed down to it from the early English in the lower portion; the latter, has rejected all curves except the cusps and heads of the arches in its upper compartment, and has the lights in the lower, subdivided by mullions and transoms, so as to break it into tiers of minute parallelograms, each repeating the arch with its cusps, in a manner which no beauty of proportion or enrichment can exempt from the charge of monotony and tameness, in comparison with the ease of its western rival; and such is the general character of the windows in the choir, as compared with those in the nave.

It was some time before the Perpendicular style departed from the general beauty and boldness of *proportion* which had distinguished its predecessor; but as the deviation from curves to straight lines in the tracery, was in itself a change materially for the worse, so it led to a proportionate stiffness and sharpness in the mouldings and other ornaments, which still farther changed its character from the elegance of the preceding period, and obliges us, with all its magnificence, in the hands of architects like Wykeham and Waynflete, to point it out as the first step of a decline, which was to end in the utter subversion, for a time, of Pointed architecture.

Its purest specimens, besides that already given, are in the naves of Canterbury and Winchester Cathedrals.

As we trace its progress through the fifteenth century (though the changes which have thus far been marked by centuries, would be more accurately described, as in the instance above, by dates commencing in the latter half or towards the close of each century, and continuing to about the same period in that which follows), this decline of architectural taste, though not of skill, is marked by the gradual depression of the arch, and consequent increase of width in comparison with height, in the general proportions; the more complex clustering of pillars and distribution of mouldings; and the accumulation of ornaments, so that between stalls and niches, with canopy surmounting canopy, panneling on the walls, heraldic and other ornaments on the cornices, and the most intricate groin-work overspreading the roof, it is scarcely possible to find a plain surface on which the eye can rest.

This exuberance of ornament, which to an ordinary observer

would have suggested the use of the term "*decorated*" as appropriate to the last rather than any preceding period of Pointed architecture, becomes most apparent in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Our present guides have not deemed the peculiarities of this period of sufficient importance to constitute a distinct style, though the substitution of the four-centred for the equilateral arch, would seem of at least equal moment, as a distinctive feature, with that of rectilinear for curvilinear tracery. In common parlance however, they designate it the Florid or Tudor Gothic, and its descending steps may be traced in the stately chapels of St. George at Windsor, King's College, Cambridge, and Henry VII. at Westminster. Many of the buildings of this late period, as the Church of the Holy Trinity at Hull, have windows of so wide a span, as at the first entrance, to convey an impression of insecurity, not easily effaced, appearing when seen in perspective, to sustain roofs of stone or solid timber, on walls of glass. The light, too, thus lavishly poured in, is glaring to the eye, and destructive of all harmony and repose in the general effect. But this is not the fault of the builders, who doubtless designed these broad perforations for painted glass, which, admirable as it is in combination with architecture at every period of the pointed styles, sheds its most brilliant and softening radiance over this last hour of their expiring day. Its effect in subduing the excess of light, and justifying so large a proportion of window to wall, is happily to be enjoyed to the full in King's College Chapel, where, instead of seeming too slight to bear up the ponderous mass of stone which spreads its fret-work from side to side, the solemn colouring of the windows seems to subdue the lightness of the masonry. It is as if the walls were hung with gorgeous tapestry, having the advantage of transparency superadded to its strength of texture, richness of colour, and freedom of design; and all idea of perforation is well nigh lost. We say nothing of the effect on the mind produced by the arrangement of subjects in the windows of this exquisite structure; incidents from the Old Testament in the upper compartments, harmonizing in the lower with similar transactions from the New, and all terminating at the east, in the one great object of Christian attraction—the awful scene of the crucifixion. But we doubt not many will sympathize with the sentiments expressed by a Cambridge minstrel:—

“Cool in autumnal noon, the stony couch
That bounds each clustering shaft in yon light nave
Hath held me wondering, while the sun's warm touch
Revived each form a Raphael's pencil gave.

Pane after pane, Redemption's path I ranged—
 Here, the dark night or shadowy dawn to gild,
 Prophets and types appeared—there, all was changed,
 The type withdrawn—the prophecy fulfilled—
 And the red orb rose awful in the East,
 Where all those glimmering beams of glory met ;
 There the great prophet died—the spotless priest
 Atoned—the sovereign paid the sinner's debt.—
 While scenes like these the sister arts upheld,
 And the loud organ lent its cadence deep,
 And sacred poesy the chorus swelled,
 Devotion's handmaids each—Oh who could weep !
 Despondent weep—nor join the anthem then,
 Exultant in meek hope of guilt forgiven,
 With angels and archangels, holy men,
 And all the harmonious company of heaven."

The last of the three great structures which have been named, discovers most plainly the defects and redundancies of the Florid style of pointed Architecture, which its gorgeous magnificence and minute decoration, in the hands of a bold and skilful architect, almost tempt us to overlook. Every thing like greatness and unity of design is frittered away, in the perpetual indentations of chapels and screen-work ; the windows avoid excess of light, by numberless subdivisions which well nigh exclude it ; the profusion of statuary, badges, and devices on the walls, mounting up from the very base to the roof, distracts and fatigues the eye ; and the marvels of construction there manifested, the mazy circles of its fan-tracery, the inimitable lightness of its pendants, which can only be matched by the stalactites in a basaltic cave, but ill compensate for the general character of depression which belongs to this and all parts of the structure, and which is strikingly contrasted with the early characteristics of pointed Architecture, as displayed in all other parts of the church to which it is attached. Indeed the two extremes of elevation and depression in the pointed arch and its accompaniments, the wide changes which had been silently effected between 1245 and 1502, can no where be more distinctly contemplated, than in advancing from the western to the eastern extremity of Westminster Abbey. The exterior of this latter portion also exemplifies the substitution of an ogree-shaped dome for the spires and pinnacles (another mark of depression in comparison with preceding times) ; and amidst the ornaments, which here also are as exuberant as within, grotesque and monstrous animals frequently take place of foliage and more shapely forms, and are seen creeping up the arch-buttresses, or revelling

on the crockets and cornices, as creatures of evil omen, anticipating an approaching wreck.

To the very latest period, however, of its existence, the Tudor style continued to make considerable amends for declining taste, by magnificence and solidity of construction. Many of our most substantial parish churches, with coved or flat timber roofs, richly pannelled and moulded, belong to this period, and compensate, in a great measure, for the decay of elegance, by gravity and solemnity of character. Wolsey's work at Christ Church, with the towers of Bolton, Fountains, and other northern abbeys, where, unsuspecting of the impending storm, the most costly structures were in progress at the moment of the general dissolution, shew a strong disposition in the architects to disencumber the style, of meretricious decoration, and exhibit its leading features in association with something of a return to primitive simplicity; and even at Hampton Court and other buildings where this recommendation is wanting, there is a grandeur and sumptuousness, both of design and execution, which give dignity to its expiring efforts, and render pointed Architecture, which had been beautiful and comely in its rise, no less glorious and majestic in its fall.

Early in the sixteenth century, the semicircular arch, after a banishment of about three hundred years, began to reappear, at first on monuments, afterwards in buildings. Its resumption of power, was scarcely a more violent change than any of the preceding transitions; for the point, which distinguished the rival style, had become gradually so obtuse as scarcely to be discoverable, and flat-headed apertures, with only a slight curvature at the sides, three-centred, or elliptical arches, made easy way for the restoration of the Roman arch with all its classical accompaniments. Nothing of this kind appears in the architecture of Henry VII.'s chapel, but it is the character of his tomb by Torrigiano, and the monument of Dr. Young, in the Rolls chapel, by the same artist, dated 1516, and that of Sir Anthony Browne, in Battle church, dated 1540, are decided specimens of revived Roman Architecture.

The mixed style which resulted from this revival, though proving itself capable of great magnificence in the entrance to the schools at Oxford, and occasionally seen in churches, as at St. Catharine Cree, London, and the chapel of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, did not, in this country, ally itself to ecclesiastical, so kindly as to civil architecture, in which, in spite of all its incongruities, it has left most splendid memorials in the houses of our nobility and gentry during the reigns of Elizabeth and the first Stuarts. Nor could even the talents of Inigo

Jones, and Sir Christopher Wren, produce anything like harmony between Roman and Gothic Architecture. The abortive attempts of the latter, may be seen in the towers of Westminster abbey, and some of the London churches ; those of the former at St. Paul's, have happily perished ; we wish we could add, *without the destruction of the Norman cathedral to which they were annexed* ; for, with sincere reverence for the talents of our great architect, and for the illustrious monument of his genius whose type adorns our cover, we could well have dispensed even with the *one* classical cathedral, which now rears its head amongst us, to attest the unsuitableness of its style to the object at which it aims. No one can compare St. Paul's, magnificent as it is, with the meanest of our Gothic minsters, without perceiving at once its inferiority, whether from the disruption of ancient associations, or some inherent defect of architectural character, in the power of awakening those impressions of awe and solemnity, which in other cathedrals are instantaneous and involuntary. If we can detach ourselves, by a strong effort, from the deadening influence of the days of King Charles II., and determine to lose sight and thought of the many heathen reminiscences which surround us, it carries us back, by its gloom and coldness, to the caves and catacombs of the early Christians, rather than to any intermediate period in ecclesiastical history ; and so far, we are willing to accept it, however contrary to the intentions of its founders, as an excellent preparative for days of persecution, a powerful refresher of primitive feelings and duties, in the midst of external splendour.

We have, perhaps, the fewer sympathies with the modern cathedral of St. Paul, from our conviction that its predecessor, of which Hollar has preserved the resemblance, and which far surpassed it in almost all its dimensions, was needlessly sacrificed to the preference for a different style, when quite as capable of restoration as York is at the present moment. In that style very far superior churches were produced (we speak of the interior, for the exterior has all the characters of greatness and nobility of conception, and has been preferred by the most competent judges, even to its great prototype at Rome) both by Sir Christopher Wren himself, and his followers in the reign of Queen Anne—churches in which something more of the cheerfulness of aspect befitting Christian worship is attained, without the surrender of that grave consistency, devotional seriousness, and dignified stability of character, which become the temple, as well as the worshippers, of “the everlasting God.” Nor are these characteristics wanting in many churches which imitate the classical orders in the present day, and for which, amidst the

unfeatured uniformity of modern streets, varied only by Italian villas, the termini of railroads, and a thousand fantastic creations in the squares, crescents, and rotundas of the suburbs, no fitter styles could perhaps be substituted. But the general character of the revived Roman and Grecian Architecture amongst us, especially as exemplified in the churches in and around the metropolis, where the great fire, the changes of fashion, and the increase of population, have afforded it freest room to expatiate, is that of soporific heaviness in its earlier, and unseemly levity in its later day. Of the intermediate period, the less that is said the better. It has devolved on our own age, to repair, as it may, the injuries moral and ecclesiastical, of a long interval of neglect, during which very few memorials of Church Architecture are to be found; and those, such as with rare exceptions, have been truly said to possess, beyond simple deformity, no character whatever.

We cannot let this subject drop without referring to the Cambridge Camden Society, the first part of whose published labours are now lying before us.

They have been some time employed in investigating the churches of Cambridgeshire and the adjoining counties, collecting all the particulars respecting them, and making drawings, with a view to publication, of all most worthy the public curiosity. We feel convinced that this society, and the similarly constituted society at Oxford, will be the means of doing much good, by reviving the true principles of Church Architecture. They are now also publishing a series of monumental brasses, in which undertaking we wish them every success.

In returning, with willing steps, to the earlier styles which have now passed rapidly under review, and which have been pointed out, as furnishing, with various degrees of excellence, the most appropriate models for the imitation of modern church-builders, we cannot but remark that there is a certain character in the subordinate members and ornaments of the respective ages, corresponding with that of their main feature, the arch, which is too apt to be overlooked, but which is essential to the "keeping" of the building, whatever be the species of Pointed Architecture it may profess to follow. For instance, the crockets and finials, while the arch retains its lancet or equilateral form, have a much slighter curvature than when its span is increased; and spread their leaves apart, in accordance with its expansion and depression, during the Perpendicular and Tudor periods. The shield also (which we have sometimes seen carefully copied in stone, from the every-day seal of a patron, as if its *shape* were as essential to heraldic correctness, as the arrange-

ment of the bearings within), takes its form from the arch ; and is acutely pointed or heater-shaped, in the early periods, grows more and more obtuse, as the Decorative declines into the Perpendicular, and at length extravagates in the variety of flattened curves, with or without points, which distinguish the style of the Tudors. Nor is it unnecessary to remark, that *Crests* have no right to accompany the shields, in buildings which profess a date anterior to the latter part of the fourteenth century ; nor have the engraved lines, &c., which designate the *colours*—a modern however valuable invention—any claim whatever to admission, where strict propriety is aimed at in the imitation of Gothic buildings.

Their cruciform construction is the ordinary distinction of Cathedral and conventual churches. The bell-tower is the badge of a church with Parochial rights ; and seems to have been so from the days of Athelstan, when the patronage of such a structure was one of the qualifications for the title of Thane. Chapels were content with a turret or bell-gable ; nor did even the royal foundations at Windsor and Cambridge, aspire to cast aside the usual tokens of ecclesiastical subordination, though occasional deviations from the rule may be adduced, bearing date from very early times. How far it is desirable to adhere to the latter distinction at present, may be questioned. We think it of moment that new churches should, especially in populous places, have districts assigned them, and be rendered parochial ; their dependence on the parent foundation being seldom otherwise than a cause of irritation. But where the filial structure is still supplied with religious offices from the parent, or other circumstances cause the dependence to be felt and valued, it may be well to retain its external symbol, both as an observance of ancient propriety, and as giving rise to a not unpleasing variety in the form of our Church Architecture.

From what has been said on the subject of association, it will be seen that we are no rigid exacters of precise uniformity in the design of an ecclesiastical building ; in truth, much of the effect on the imagination created by our older churches, results from the skill and judgment with which the Architecture and monuments of various periods are made to combine in one harmonious whole ; and great as is the delight with which we contemplate such structures as the cathedrals of Salisbury and York, in which the leading characteristics are perfect unity of plan, or perfect symmetry, combined with vastness of proportion, the palm of producing an ineffaceable impression at a single view, must, we think, be conceded to Canterbury, and other cathedrals, far inferior in these respects, but in which an indescribable felicity in the adaptation of the various parts to each other, and

to the general design—"non facies una, nec diversa tamen"—opens unexpected beauties at every step we take; and combining, in glass, in marble, in brass, and mosaics, every distinguishing feature which occurs between the Saxon and Tudor periods, presents us with an assemblage of architectural graces, such as can never satiate either the eye or the mind.

The former class of structures represents the Church of one age, the latter that of every age: the Architecture of the former is admired—that of the latter felt.

We do not, of course, recommend the crowding of every style into one building, especially one of small dimensions: it is only meant, that where the magnitude and distribution of parts in a building admit of it, some diversity of style, such as is constantly found in ancient churches, some deviation from tame uniformity in the number and arrangement even of component features in the same style, may be safely, though cautiously, admitted as a beauty, instead of being invariably shunned as a defect.

There has been room for apprehension lest the lancet style, simple and pleasing as it is, should by its cheapness monopolize the public taste, so as to become wearisome by continual repetition, in our new churches: but we have latterly seen unexceptionable specimens of the Norman, and even of the later English styles, giving evident token that public taste and liberality, as well as architectural skill, are decidedly on the rise. In some instances, the German and Lombard modifications of the declining Roman Architecture, distinguished by the title of Romanesque, have been introduced to our notice: but with many attractive features, and every advantage from the sites chosen and the science of the architect, they labour under the inherent defect that they are aliens to the soil; their claim on English sympathies and attachments is yet to be acquired; and wherever they deviate from our own Saxon or Norman examples, which may be considered as native offsets from the same original root, our native tastes or prejudices, still as ever, "*hospitibus feri*," are apt to pronounce the deviation for the worse.

We are not inclined to look abroad for improvements, either of ancient or modern date. We trace the changes of our Architecture, as of our institutions ecclesiastical and civil, to no violent disruption, no foreign dictation, but to the persevering direction of native zeal and talent, liable indeed to deterioration and decline, but gifted by Divine Providence with a principle of revival, and putting forth at this moment fresh energies, after ages of suspension. May the spirit of the first founders and builders of churches distinguish every age of their successors, and no period of slumber need again be feared.

- ART. V.—*The Hope of the Navy ; or the True Source of Discipline and Efficiency, as set forth in the Articles of War.* By Rear-Admiral Sir JAHLEEL BRENTON, Bart., K.C.B., Lieut.-Governor of Greenwich Hospital. Nisbet.
2. *Extracts from Holy Writ, and various Authors ; intended as Helps to Meditation and Prayer, principally intended for Soldiers and Seamen.* By Captain Sir NESBIT J. WILLOUGHBY, R.N., C.B., K.C.H. London. 1840. Printed for gratuitous circulation.
3. *The Church in the Navy and Army.* Edinburgh : Innes.
4. *A Reverie of a Retired Officer on the Naval and Military Bible Society ; addressed to Red Coats and Blue Jackets.* London : Simpkin.
5. *An Appeal to the British Nation in behalf of our Sailors.* By Sir JAHLEEL BRENTON. Nisbet.

WE noticed these Volumes in a former Number, as affording tokens of the increased interest which thinking people are beginning to take in the moral welfare of our soldiers and sailors ; and desiring to impart to this interest a proper direction in favour of those for whom it had been awakened, we urged the necessity of something being immediately done to bring a system of spiritual superintendence to bear on both services with greater effect than under the present systems. We had shown the wants and necessities of the Army in this respect when our paper was cut short for want of further space. The case of the Navy next engages our attention.

The introduction of Chaplains to the establishments of our ships of war seems to have been first adopted* in the year 1626, as appears by a letter dated York House, July 29th, from George Duke of Buckingham to the University of Cambridge, in behalf of Daniel Ambrose, M.A. fellow of one of the colleges, who was appointed Chaplain to one of the King's ships, stating that his Majesty expected the University would not suffer him to experience any loss or inconvenience in the college to which he belonged from being so employed in the Navy ; and it was accordingly ordered that Mr. Ambrose should have the benefit of his fellowship during the whole period of his service at sea.

From that time the service was more or less supplied with Chaplains until about fifty years ago, when the spiritual destitution of the Navy appears to have reached its lowest ebb. The very mention of religion was treated, for the most part, with

* According to Falconer.

ridicule and contempt; and the services, if performed at all, were hurried over in the most disgraceful and slovenly manner. And where ships were provided with Chaplains, their conduct was too frequently anything but likely to gain them credit. Much of the want of proper deference due to them, where they deserved it, is to be laid at the door of the Captains of the ships in which they served. We are sorry to say that there are instances on record of not only Captains, but Commanders-in-chief, at a later period than that to which we chiefly refer, being found the foremost to set an example of ridiculing and holding up to contempt the men whose sacred office is generally presumed to ensure them, at least common courtesy, if not respect. We copy the following anecdote in proof of this fact from Captain Brenton's *Life of Earl St. Vincent* :—

"One Sunday, after divine service had been performed, whether or not his lordship thought the good Dr. Morgan wanted brightening up, or that he had too little to do, I cannot say, but he called Mr. Moore, the signal-lieutenant, and inquired of him whether there was such a thing as a black flag on board? 'No, my lord,' said the officer; 'but we have a black and white one.' 'That will do, sir; make the signal for all lieutenants.' The signal was at the mast-head in an instant; and an order given that whenever the black-and-white flag was displayed, with a red pendent over it, it was the signal for all Chaplains. What followed was, I think, what the French call *un peu malin*. A few days after it 'blew great guns' from the W.S.W., which is directly into the Bay of Cadiz, so well known since by the battle of Trafalgar. The in-shore squadron lay six miles from the flag-ship, directly to leeward, and up went the signal for all Chaplains. It was a hard pull for the rowers, and no luxury for the sitters. When they reached the quarter-deck of the *Ville de Paris*, literally drenched with salt water, the Admiral presented them to 'Bishop Morgan,' as he called his Chaplain, and desired that they would go down into the ward-room and hold a conclave. I am afraid this 'freshener' for the Chaplains cost Dr. Morgan half-a-dozen of sherry to repel the humidity: and I do not think anything was gained by it in the cause of religion and virtue.'—Vol. i. p. 380.

No wonder, then, that the coarse and ungentlemanlike treatment to which they were exposed should have constantly operated to restrain men who had any respect for themselves from going afloat.

Sir J. Brenton, indeed, observes ("*Hope of the Navy*," p. 276.) that he never remembers an instance in which a Chaplain has been treated with slight, or deprived of that deference to which he was entitled by his profession, unless he himself had departed from the becoming line of conduct. This is what, generally

speaking, might reasonably enough be expected. But while we pay all deference to the assertion of the gallant and excellent Admiral, he will allow us to remind him that it was difficult, almost impossible, for the reasons we have stated above, to get men to enter the service who were likely to conduct themselves in a becoming manner—or to get men, indeed, to embark in the service at all.

In Lord Exmouth's fleet, which consisted of upwards of 120 sail of various classes, there were not above three or four Chaplains, if so many, dispersed over the whole. We are happy to say, however, that since that period a gradual improvement has taken place; the duties are better understood and better performed, and the number of Chaplains afloat greatly increased. In proof of this we subjoin a list of the ships at present in commission which are provided with Chaplains, according to the latest published documents :

SHIPS.	STATION.	NAME.	DATE.
Asia, 84	Mediterranean	P. G. Hill	April 26, 1834
Bellerophon, 80	Ditto	P. Somerville	April 28, 1838
Benbow, 72	Ditto	J. Jenkins (and schoolmaster)	May 7, 1839
Blenheim, 72	East Indies	G. Cooper (& do)	May 29, 1839
Britannia, 120	Portsmouth	J. Falls	April 19, 1839
Cambridge, 78	Sheerness	P. P. Smith	March 2, 1840
Castor 36,	Mediterranean	Jos. Marshall	May 8, 1837
Donegal, 78	Lisbon	J. W. Campbell	Aug. 26, 1839
Edinburgh, 72	Mediterranean	R. Wilson (and schoolmaster)	Nov. 20, 1837
Ganges, 84	Ditto	G. Ross Lewin	Jan. 16, 1839
Hastings, 72	Ditto	W. G. Tucker	Nov. 7, 1839
Howe, 120	Sheerness	J. Cooper	April 18, 1839
Implacable, 74	Mediterranean	John Moore	Nov. 14, 1839
Impregnable, 104	Plymouth	A. Watson	April 30, 1839
Ocean, 80	Sheerness	J. B. Sanders	July 1, 1838
Pique, 36	Portsmouth	J. Marshall	Aug. 16, 1837
Powerful, 84	Mediterranean	O. Harrison	June 8, 1839
President, 50	South America	A. H. Small	Oct. 30, 1837
Princess Charlotte, 104	Mediterranean	E. Kitson	Feb. 10, 1837
Rodney		R. J. Oliver	June 29, 1840
San Joseph, 110	Plymouth	J. E. Surridge	Dec. 15, 1836
Seringapatam, 42	North America	G. Austen	April 11, 1837
Stag, 46	South America and West Indies	E. C. Phelps	Nov. 30, 1836
Vanguard, 80	Portsmouth	G. Richards	
Victory, 102	Ditto	E. Winder*	Sept. 17, 1838
Wellesley, 72	East Indies	H. Jones	Sept. 28, 1837
Winchester, 50	North America and West Indies	H. S. Slight	July 8, 1839

This greatly improved state of things is to be attributed,

* Since appointed Chaplain to the British Church Establishment at Alexandria.

under providence, to various causes. The first and most prominent is probably the protracted peace; but there is likewise to be added an improvement in the civilization, for we may well so term it, of the Navy. Captains and Lieutenants are no longer the blustering sea-dogs, which too many of them were in former days, but elegant, polished, high-bred gentlemen. We believe that there is not an Admiral at present in the service, who would not feel heartily ashamed of deliberately insulting a body of clergymen in the manner recorded of Sir John Jervis. A clergyman now going afloat usually finds himself associated with companionable beings—with men, in fact, in all respects so agreeable, that the only danger is, that amidst the allurements of their society, he may be apt to forget that consistency which is so pre-eminently necessary in his profession of all others. Sir Jahleel Brenton has recorded an admirable example, however, of the manner in which a man may conduct himself, if he have only the force of mind combined with the grace to do so, and the instance is the more interesting, because it refers to a time when such cases were much rarer than, by the blessing of God, we believe them to be now. The case to which he alludes is that of the Rev. Evan Halliday, who was Chaplain of his Majesty's ship *Cæsar* when he commanded her in 1801-2, and who died a few years since Chaplain of the Dock-yard at Devonport:

"Mr. Halliday, in the first place, by his general conduct, secured to himself the respect and admiration of all the young men with whom, as a messmate, he was associated in the ward-room, who treated him with the utmost deference and attention; so much so, that upon his entrance to the ward-room, if any trifling or improper conversation was going on, it immediately ceased, and the same delicacy was observed as though a lady had been present.

"He was not satisfied with the bare performance of his Sunday duties: he endeavoured in any way to be useful to his flock. For instance, when any person was put upon the list of culprits, he became immediately an object of Mr. Halliday's solicitation. If confined, he was seen sitting by him for a considerable time, and making himself thoroughly acquainted with the circumstances of the offence committed, as well as with the character and habits of the offender. With this information he was frequently enabled, when the man was brought up for punishment, to intercede for him, and to obtain a mitigation, if not a remission of it, thus putting it in the power of the Captain to exercise lenity without injury to discipline. His discourses on the Sunday had always a particular reference to the events of the past week, the various circumstances or offences of which were commented on in such a manner as might be calculated to leave a deep impression upon the minds of his hearers, and a conviction that they had a friend to whom they might safely confide, not only their distresses, but their errors."

It is delightful to find such a testimony as this recorded upon such authority, but it must be borne in mind that Mr. Halliday possessed two advantages, which may not fall to the lot of every one, however good his intentions, or however anxious he may be, in all things, to fulfil the duties of his sacred profession. Mr. Halliday was, in the first place, clearly an individual of no common force of mind, which combined with his admirable piety to aid him in maintaining a sound consistency in all things ; and in the second place, he knew himself to be fully and cordially supported in all he did by the Captain, without which no Chaplain can ever do his duty efficiently. The great object should be to place every Chaplain in such circumstances as may insure for him, at least so far as outward arrangement can, the means of imitating so bright an example.

The character of this excellent departed clergyman, to whom Sir Jahleel Brenton has reared so noble a monument of praise, appears to have much resembled that of St. Paul. Firm, stedfast, and enduring, he seems to have looked difficulties in the face only to overcome them. But there are many who approach nearer to the character of St. Peter ; who, while they love much perhaps, are sadly wanting in that decision of character which enables them, by the merciful assistance of God's good Spirit, manfully to resist every temptation. The less, therefore, that such can be exposed to it, the brighter and the happier will be their course. Nothing is more difficult than to preserve the dignity of an ambassador for Christ amidst a constant association with a number of lively young men, whatever their profession, or however well-disposed. And if this be true generally, how much more does the truth hold good of the ward-room or gun-room of a man-of-war ? The fact is, the Chaplain has ever been in a false position. We cannot conceive it possible for a man to be placed in one of greater difficulty. In the first place, the circumstance of his being a warrant officer, instead of bearing a commission, has something of the effect, where distinctions of ranks are so scrupulously observed, of pushing him below his proper station ; and, in the next place, he is seldom provided with proper opportunities for retirement. Even in line-of-battle ships, where he ought, undoubtedly, to claim, as a right, one of the cabins in the ward-room, he is frequently compelled to put up with an inferior berth, nearer the region of the cock-pit, where he can only study by the wretched illumination of a purser's dip, and where he has the voices and laughter of the midshipmen to inspire and assist him in the preparation of his discourses. The naval regulations, as regards the Chaplain, are very good, as far as they go, and the

naval instructions for his conduct leave nothing to be desired by way of addition to them;* but, except in a few rare cases

* By an order in council, dated March 4th, 1812, made by His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, in the name and on behalf of his Majesty, the following regulations, in respect to half-pay or pension to be allowed to Chaplains of his Majesty's fleet, after long and meritorious service, as well as the pay and allowance during the period of such servitude shall be established in future, viz :—

1. That every ship in her Majesty's Navy, from a first to a fifth rate inclusive, shall be allowed a Chaplain on her establishment. (The fifth-rate embraces a very large class of vessels from one of between 30 and 40 guns down to the lowest number to which a post-captain is allowed, which is 20 guns. Ships therefore carrying as low as 20 guns are entitled to a Chaplain.)

2. That every Chaplain, after eight years of actual sea-service (or, if in a guard-ship, ten years), during which period he shall not have been absent from his duty six weeks at any one time, except by special leave from the Board of Admiralty, who shall produce certificates of his good conduct and moral behaviour from the Captains he may have served under, shall be entitled to a pension in the nature of half-pay; but no Chaplain to be entitled to half-pay or pension, if he shall accept any preferment with cure of souls, during the term of his required service at sea.

3. That the amount of this pension or half-pay to each Chaplain shall be 5s. per day.

The 4th and 5th Articles provide, that if a Chaplain shall by circumstances, not depending on himself, be prevented from serving his full period, he may receive a proportionate pension; and if he serve more than the required period, a larger allowance.

6. That length of service and meritorious conduct shall render Chaplains eligible to all the chaplaincies of all naval establishments whatever, the disposal of which, shall or may be left to the consideration of the Board of Admiralty; and that no other Clergyman shall be eligible to any of those pieces of preferment than a Navy Chaplain; and that the presentations to any of those pieces of preferment, whose emoluments may amount to 400*l.* per annum, shall cause the half-pay of the respective Chaplains to cease, as is provided by law, in the case of the divided living of Simonbourn.

7. That the pay of a Chaplain, while in actual service, shall be according to the following rates, viz : 150*l.* per annum, and the established compensation of 11*l.* 18*s.* a year for a seniority in each rate, and to have a cabin allotted to him in the ward-room or gun-room, where he is to mess with the Lieutenants, and to be rated for victuals; and when the Chaplain shall be willing to act as Schoolmaster, he shall be entitled to the bounty of 20*l.* a year, granted by her late Majesty Queen Anne, by her order in council of the 21st of April, 1702, provided he shall pass an examination before the Lieutenant-Governor, professor and preceptor of the Royal Naval College at Portsmouth, instead of at the Trinity House, as required by the above-mentioned order in council; and he shall be further entitled to 5*l.* per annum, to be paid to him by every young midshipman and volunteer of the first class, as a remuneration for his education; the same to be stopped out of the said young gentleman's pay.

8. That a Chaplain-General shall be appointed with such emoluments as may be deemed proper by the Board of Admiralty, to whom all applications for appointments shall be made, or will be referred, and all regulations entrusted relating to the establishment of Chaplains for the Royal Navy, in the same manner as is practised with regard to Army Chaplains.

9. That no warrant will be granted by the Board of Admiralty to any candidate for an appointment, unless recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and Bishop of London, through the Chaplain-General, as in every way properly qualified.

10. That Chaplains now serving in the Navy, who may, upon due examina-

of singular personal firmness of character, such as falls to the lot of few, we will defy him to comply with a tithe of the spirit of those instructions, until his situation be materially improved—until he be placed, in fact, on a totally different footing, as regards his charge. Let us look at what the Chaplain really is. He is, in fact, so far as regards spirituals, Commander of the ship. The ship is his floating parish—his cure of souls amidst the waters. But, if this be the case, as it undeniably is, then why not grant him privileges more in accordance with his high station? Every one knows and confesses the necessity of the *Captain's* not being herded with the rest of the officers—every one feels the necessity of seclusion for *him*, in order to the proper maintenance of his power. But the authorities appear to have strangely overlooked the fact, that seclusion is no less necessary for the Chaplain. It may be asked, how can this be secured him? How can his present anomalous and difficult position be improved? Our reply is, that the remedy is at once obvious and easy. Let it be so arranged that he mess with the Captain. This ought not to be considered any unseemly intrusion on the privacy of the first in command; nor indeed would it be so in reality, since, except where the Captain has not the means of keeping a table, the officer and one of the mates of the watch always dine with him as it is, and generally one or two others besides. So that, though in proposing this arrangement, we should be as sincere “non-intrusionists” as Dr. Chalmers himself, it is evident that “intrusion,” in this case, there would be none; or, like the General Assembly of the Kirk, we should be inclined to vote the Captain the privilege of a “Veto.” The pecuniary part of the matter might be easily arranged. Then, as regarded a berth:—We agree with Sir Jahleel Brenton, that in line-of-battle ships the Chaplain should, undoubtedly, have one of the cabins in the ward-room; and that, not as a favour, but as a matter of right; as enjoined by the 7th Article of the Naval Instructions, quoted above; and in ships of smaller rating accommodation ought to be provided in proportion.

If it be objected to all this, that at present he only classes as

tion, be deemed proper to be continued, shall be allowed the time they may have served as part (not exceeding one-half) of that required to entitle them to the pension or half-pay.

The regulations for the Chaplain's conduct are very satisfactory; they state perspicuously his duties of preaching, reading, teaching, visiting and catechising, and provide that he shall, before receiving his pay, obtain the certificate of the Captain, senior Lieutenant, and Master, to his due performance of those duties; and a similar certificate is required to be sent to the Lords of the Admiralty, on any Chaplain leaving his ship, in default of which, he cannot be appointed to another.

a warrant officer, then, by all means, let him have a commission. It might easily be worded so as to suit his office, and there would be a good deal in the name of the thing; for all sensible people know how much a name has often to do with the maintenance of authority. If it were considered advantageous for him to have a fixed rank on board, he might stand immediately after the Captain, or at lowest, after the senior Lieutenant. He would thus possess the authority of a superior officer, over all but one or two persons in the ship; and his having this recognized position, would add to his advice or rebuke the weight and gravity of command, and enable him to speak with proportionably greater authority. The principle of assigning a becoming degree of rank to the Chaplain, is fully and fairly recognized in the Army, where he regularly ranks with a Major, and senior Chaplains in the East India Company's service with Lieutenant-Colonels. What then in common reason is to prevent their brethren in the Navy from holding the precisely equivalent rank in that service; that, namely, of Commander? The marvel is that any other arrangement should ever have been adopted.

Hitherto the neglect of the comfort of the Chaplains, on the part of the Government, has been most disgraceful. If the position of the Chaplains afloat has improved, as it no doubt has, it is certainly owing, rather to the individual gentlemanlike feeling of the Commanders of the respective ships in which they have served, than to any wish to provide for their comfort on the part of the authorities at home. Their systematic slights put upon the Church, and their encouragement of popery and every other form of dissent, at the beck of a ruffian agitator and his unprincipled pack, are too well known and felt throughout this land—aye, and felt too in a manner which shall yet recoil upon them, to their own undoing—to require any more than a passing allusion to it here. Their treatment of the Church in the Navy is of a piece with the rest.

The Secretary to the Admiralty is, of course, the person with whom the Chaplains have to communicate on all matters of business. While Mr. Wood held that office there was no cause for complaint. So far from it, indeed, that the Clergy attached to the Naval service seem to have been, as far as known to us, unanimous in expressing their sense of his attentions, and of the readiness which he always showed in meeting their wishes, as far as lay in his power. But the case has since been far otherwise. On the secession of Mr. Wood, our O'Connell-ridden Ministry thought proper to appoint Mr. More O'Ferrall to the office. Mr. O'Ferrall, as all the world knows, is a Roman Catholic. Here then is one of the anomalies which

result from the advancement of Romanists to high places under Government, which our precious Ministers seem to lose no opportunity of doing, with the intention, no doubt, of strengthening the Church, which they are sworn to defend. A Roman Catholic is vested with the whole superintendence and controul, as far as regards seculars, of our whole Protestant Ecclesiastical Establishment afloat ! The monstrosity of this arrangement was too glaring not to be observed, even by the leaden optics of the first Lord of the Admiralty ; and accordingly, he has *nominally* taken the superintendence of all matters concerning Chaplains into his own hands. But how does this delightful arrangement work *practically* ? Just like all other Whig measures, it is so managed as to result in nothing but confusion and injury to the best interests of the country. Lord Minto will see no one under the rank of a Captain ; and since a Clergyman on service ranks below a Captain, in the manner we have shown, (though society on shore, of course, owns no such distinction) by this precious regulation all Chaplains are, at present, excluded from "the presence," and are, therefore, virtually left without any one to whom they can personally apply on any subject connected with their duties afloat. So much for Whig derangements at the Admiralty.

The next point which attracts our attention regards the union of the offices of Chaplain and Schoolmaster. This is by no means so late an arrangement as is generally supposed. Previously to the appointment of regular naval instructors, it was always held out to the Chaplain as a desirable thing, that he should pass an examination at the Naval College at Portsmouth, with a view to uniting the offices ; but the proposed arrangement did not come much under public notice, until after the appearance of two valuable papers, one by Capt. Basil Hall,* in the first series of his entertaining "Fragments of Voyages and Travels," in a chapter headed the "Schoolmaster afloat," and the other by Captain the Hon. F. de Ros, "On the State of Education in the British Navy," printed in the *United Service Journal* for October, 1830, Part xi., to both of which we have much pleasure in referring our readers. In consequence of these and other representations, a naval instructor was appointed to every ship above a certain rate, at a handsome salary, and the Chaplain was invited to accept the office wherever he should be judged duly qualified to accept the same. The union of the offices in the person of the Chaplain would be clearly most

* We are happy to observe that this distinguished officer is engaged in bringing out a new edition of his delightful works, at a price which cannot fail to render them accessible to all classes,

advantageous, wherever attainable. The Clergyman must have superior means of gaining the respect of his pupils. The two offices act and react upon each other; the tuition giving to the Clergyman access to the intimacy of the young officers which he could obtain by no other means, while his clerical character gives weight to his scientific instruction. The Captain would also probably attend more readily to his suggestions. Such being the presumed effect of uniting the offices, there seems no good reason why the holder of them should not be paid for both. It will be seen, however, from the list which we have published, that there are not above two or three Chaplains who combine the duties. The reason of this has its origin partly in a gross piece of injustice on the part of the authorities. A naval instructor, if not a Chaplain, has the Schoolmaster's pay, according to the ship's rate, beside provisions, and 5*l.* per annum for every young gentleman; he becomes, likewise, entitled to half-pay, after two or three years' service. But if the fittest person of all, according to the best authorities, accept the office—if the Chaplain becomes naval instructor, then, by a recent regulation, he is to have *no* Schoolmaster's pay, but only 20*l.* per annum, which is the allowance from Queen Anne's bounty, and the 5*l.* per annum for each young gentleman, and no addition to his half-pay, that is, no half-pay for having been naval instructor.* One or two individuals have already been robbed in this way. After having been at much pains in providing themselves with the requisite acquirements, after having passed the examination and received the appointment, the regulation was made which deprived them of two-thirds of the reward of their labour.

Is it, then, to be expected that men will accept a laborious and often thankless office on such terms, or that they will be at the pains to fit themselves for it? But, besides this, there is another difficulty connected with the union of the office, which is, that unless he be cordially supported in his authority by the Captain and first Lieutenant, the Chaplain will be *lowered* into the Schoolmaster, instead of the Schoolmaster being raised in the Chaplain. Under the old regulations, the Schoolmasters (*heu infelices!*) ranked with the ship's cook, and messed with their amiable pupils, the meek and obedient tmids. And we have actually known an over-bearing first Lieutenant endeavour, on one occasion, while the Chaplain held the office (which he did, moreover, gratuitously), to treat him in matters of leave,

* We may observe here that, by an error of the press, which remained unnoticed for the space of nine years!! many a future widow of Naval Chaplains will be cruelly deprived of her pension. The altering one little conjunction has made this fell difference. It would require a world of writing fully to explain this; we must, therefore, content ourselves with briefly stating the fact.

&c., as if he held no higher office than that of the unhappy being just alluded to, and to have the insolence to tell him, that in consequence of being schoolmaster he no longer ranked higher than the ship's cook. It is scarcely necessary to say that this piece of overbearing assumption on the part of the Lieutenant did not go down, and the Chaplain maintained the rights of his station. It shews, however, how uncomfortable the union of the offices may, at times, be rendered to the individual holding them. The great thing wanted is the unvarying cordial support of the Captain.

No Chaplain can, in fact, properly do his duty without this; such innumerable hindrances may be thrown in the way. We have heard of ships, carrying Chaplains, which in the course of a whole voyage only had divine service performed on board once! This state of things ought not to be permitted. Perhaps it might be well to order a return of all public religious services performed on board our ships; the reason to be stated when such service shall have been omitted. The state of the weather is often made, amongst other things, a frivolous pretext for the putting off divine service. Let us hear our experienced Admiral on this point:—

“When the ship is at sea, and even in war time, the absolute necessity of omitting divine service *very rarely occurs*, and particularly in fleets and squadrons. The precautions which are observed every day to secure to the ships' companies quiet and uninterrupted meals (and these are very seldom broken in upon), will be equally efficacious in ensuring the time necessary for divine service: in some ships the hands are never turned up but for general purposes, such as weighing, reefing, and anchoring; and all other duties are performed by the watch, not composing more than a third of the ship's company; and with this watch upon deck, where can be found the excuse for *disobeying the first article of war*,* as regards the remainder of the crew? As the time required for this most important duty seldom exceeds an hour and a half, even when a sermon is preached, this period may be in most cases secured against interruption, by judicious arrangement, whatever may be the state of the weather. It is well known to all who are accustomed to a sea life, that a gale of wind, in a well-appointed and well-conducted ship, where no danger arises from being near the land, is very far from being considered as a period of fatigue or suffering, but rather of repose, even to those who have the watch upon deck. The

* All Commanders, Captains, or Officers, in or belonging to any of her Majesty's ships or vessels of war, shall cause the public worship of Almighty God, according to the Liturgy of the Church of England, established by law, to be solemnly, orderly, and reverently performed in their respective ships, and shall take care that prayers and preaching, by the Chaplains in holy orders, of the respective ships, be performed diligently, and that the Lord's Day be observed according to law.

sails being reduced at the commencement of the gale, and the ship, in technical phrase, being made snug, the watch is exempted from work, and seldom exposed to the weather but for the few minutes which may be required in changing the direction of the course. A spirit of cheerfulness seems to pervade the whole ship's company; their meals at this time are particularly attended with mirth and good humour; which is most observable when shipping a sea, or the ship taking a lee lurch. This freedom from care at such a season may, it is true, be justly ascribed to thoughtlessness, and a total absence of any idea of danger: but it affords a convincing proof that a gale of wind under such circumstances, affords no substantial excuse for the non-performance of divine service, but, on the contrary, seems to ensure the means of its being uninterrupted; and above all, when it takes place at such a time, it would appear pre-eminently calculated to make a deep impression upon the mind. The arguments for the due performance of morning service apply equally to that of the afternoon, which is indispensable, as it enables those to attend who were necessarily absent in the morning, from having the watch upon deck."—*Hope of the Navy*, p. 160.

We are happy to know that many Commanders now afloat are truly anxious that their crews should regularly enjoy the benefit of the public services of the Church; and we may quote, amongst others, the admirable example of Sir Robert Stopford, Commander-in-chief in the Mediterranean, who not only has regular service on the Sundays, but a portion of the prayers read by the Chaplain every morning and evening; and, as might be expected, the morals of the ship have improved in direct proportion.*

Nothing is a greater mistake than to suppose, as too many have done, that the correct fulfilment of the duties of religion are inconsistent with most determined valour and spirit of enterprise. The life of the late Lord de Saumarez affords a remarkable proof to the contrary. So far from his energies having been weakened, or his mind depressed by religious feeling, they were strengthened and elevated by the divine principle, to the devotion of all his faculties to the cause of his country. And this intrepid and distinguished officer has stated in public, that he had invariably found *that the best and bravest sailors were those who habitually read their Bibles*; † his experience was a

* The administration of the sacrament would be a great point gained, but we have not heard of any ship in which this has hitherto been attempted.

† We have heard of course of skulkers, who, when sailing with a religious Captain, have attempted to make a pretence of reading their Bibles their excuse for neglecting duty. We suspect, however, that few Captains will allow themselves to be "humbled" in this way. Such fellows are sure to be found out, and brought to their bearings. The Bible teaches no man to neglect his duty, and no officer ought to admit the excuse for a moment.

most extensive one: but he gave in his own person the strongest proof of the truth of this assertion.

His noble contemporary, Lord Gambier, was another illustrious instance of the deepest religious feeling coupled with the utmost degree of unflinching resolution. The Rev. E. Ward, Minister of Iwer, in preaching his funeral sermon, has annexed an observation to which we heartily respond: "Thank God," he says, "the reproach of irreligion is now being wiped away from the Navy of Great Britain; and he whose bright example we are contemplating lived to see a goodly number of that gallant profession men of prayer, men of one book, living in the fear of God, and glorying in the cross of Christ."

What we admire about Sir Jahleel Brenton's book is, that it takes its stand upon the articles of war, and exhibits, in fact, in itself, a carrying out of the principles of those articles. The interest of the work, in a professional point of view, commences about the 150th page, and continues throughout the volume. This latter part will amply repay a careful perusal.

It is truly delightful to find names which belong to the history of the country, and which stand enrolled there, in a golden and a glorious page, the first and the foremost of those great and daring spirits who hurled Britannia's thunder against the foe, during the terrific struggles of the latter portion of the last century and the earlier part of the present, now coming forward in lending a hand to sanctify the wreath of victory, by emblazoning the words "Holiness to the Lord" amidst the triumphal decorations of the naval and the mural crown. The name of Brenton stands amongst the highest of those on this illustrious scroll of worthies. His action with the French frigates, when he commanded the *Cæsar*, is alone sufficient to immortalize his name.

But here arises another star, to claim our attention—a star of the first magnitude in the bright galaxy of naval exploit and fame. Who has not heard of the daring fire-eater, Sir Nesbit Willoughby? The hero who may well be said to have earned for himself the title of "bravest of the brave." If any there be who remain in such a state of "crass ignorance" (we thank Lord Brougham for the expression), as not to have heard of the achievements of this intrepid veteran, let them look into James's "Naval History," and there shall they read of his exploits, and there shall they see his portrait, seamed with the scars of battle on its front; and if they would go on, and learn how the fear of God can live and reign in a heart which has known no other fear,* then let them read his "Extracts from

* "Je crains Dieu cher Abner, et je n'ai aucun autre crainte."—*Athaliah*.

Holy Writ," with its unpretending, but admirably instructive preface, and they shall rise from the perusal wiser, and we trust better men. When the work first came out, some of the godless made, as they thought, an excellent joke upon its publication. They said it was the result of its gallant author's having been severely shot in the head (he carries, we believe, a bullet in his left cheek at the present moment, besides having lost an eye). All we can say is, that if such be the results of being shot in the head, the best wish which we can offer for those who cracked the joke, as they thought it, is, that they may be made, as soon as possible, partakers of a similar fate. Sir Nesbit has thought fit to have a crucifix imprinted above the title on the binding, which has given rise to the odd misapprehension, on the part of some, that the work was the production of a Roman Catholic. This is exceedingly absurd. Why should the Romish apostacy be permitted the exclusive appropriation of the sacred emblem of man's redemption? The increased use of it, on the part of Protestants, would, we think, be a token, not of a return to popery, but to that true Catholicism, from whence many ultra-Protestants have wandered far enough, in all conscience. The present edition is published chiefly for gratuitous circulation, but we hope soon to see another, which all may be afforded the opportunity of purchasing.

The book entitled "The Church in the Navy and Army," by a retired Chaplain of Stirling Castle, is published as a sort of supplement to a former work, by the same author, called "The Church in the Army." It consists of a most interesting—in fact, an exceedingly entertaining collection of correspondence and anecdotes, illustrative of the progress of religion in both services. Out of the many very delightful narratives with which the book abounds, we have only space to select one, which we present as rather unique. We cannot prefix to it a more appropriate title than that of—

RETIREMENT IN A HAT.

Speaking of a conversation with a pious sailor, who distinguished himself by his desperate valour at the battle of Navarino, having rushed to a gun, at which all the men lay killed or wounded, and having been chiefly instrumental in saving two ports from being beaten into one by the heavy fire of two Turkish line-of-battle ships, which had completely cleared several of the guns for the moment, by killing or wounding every one stationed at them; our author says that he observed to him, "I should like to know what was the state of your mind

when you saw the Turkish fleet and the drum beat to quarters, as you entered the bay?" "All I wanted," he answered, "was some retired spot for prayer, that I might commend my soul to God, for a few moments, just before I went into action." "You would find that a difficulty indeed, in a man-of-war, after the orders were given to clear away for action." "True, but there's *retirement in a hat*." "In a hat! I don't understand you." "Perhaps not, and therefore I'll explain myself. We were sailing into the bay, I thought there was a moment of leisure, and leaning over the bulwark of the forecastle, I took off my hat, and covering my face with the hat, I secretly breathed out this prayer: 'O Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit, for thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth; thou hast the issues of life and death; all events are at thy command. I leave myself entirely at thy disposal; and if I should be killed in battle take care of my family; save my soul, and receive me up into thy glory, O Lord, through Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour. Amen.' There, Sir, there is retirement in a hat."

We think the work, from its style and manner of compilation, likely to be not only instructive, but exceedingly entertaining, to our soldiers and sailors. It is full of anecdotes of naval and military adventure, each seasoned with some display of religious feeling—showing how God can be served, even amidst the rage of the most tempestuous conflict.

The "Reverie addressed to Red Coats and Blue Jackets" is a useful little tract or pamphlet, about sixteen pages, which originally appeared in the "United Service Gazette." For, to the honour of that journal be it spoken, it is not ashamed thus to consecrate its pages to the service of religion, as it may find opportunity. The "Reverie" is now re-published as a tract, at the wish of several Clergymen and many Officers.

The opening of it is so admirably graphic, that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of copying it verbatim:—

"To the Editors of the 'United Service Gazette.'

"Gentlemen,—I picture to myself some of your readers, as soon as the heading of this article meets their eye, exclaiming—'Oh the Saints'—'Hypocrites,' say others—'Self-righteous Fellows'—'Cant'—'Humbug!'—'Pray turn to something else,' is re-echoed through the club or barrack-room.

"Now, my comrades, 'judge not rashly'—for God only knows who is a hypocrite, and who is not. At the great and general review of us all, at the day of judgment (and not till then), it will be seen who has done his duty in this world, and who has not," &c.

A noted divine used to say that there ought to be three R's in every sermon: Ruin by sin, Redemption by Christ, and Re-

generation by the Holy Ghost. These three R's are set forth in this little tract in a manner to interest and benefit any class of people, be they who they may. We hope to see it in extensive circulation, in our Army and Navy particularly. It is by no means the "Reverie" of a useless dreamer.

After all, however, as we observed, the great importance of these works, and those of a similar class, is the proof which they afford of a growing anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the brave defenders of our native land. And we trust that this feeling will continue to go on and increase, till no station in our colonies of sufficient magnitude, and no ship in our fleets of the requisite rating, is left without a proper supply of spiritual superintendence. Of the Army we can only say, as regards its Ecclesiastical Establishment, "Oh reform it altogether!" As regards the Navy, we have shown that the machinery for its spiritual welfare is already, to a certain extent, in existence, and requires nothing but improvement and adaptation. We have only to compare the list of Chaplains serving afloat at present with those before 1823* even, to see how much has been done in this respect. For the great improvements in this department, the Navy stands indebted to the Right Honourable John Wilson Croker. We are happy to know also, that the character and respectability of the Chaplains never stood so high as they do at present. When a new ship is put in commission, the first question generally asked, after "who is the Captain and first Lieutenant," is, "who is the Chaplain?" This is as it ought to be. Naval Officers indeed, generally speaking, now feel somewhat proud of having a Chaplain attached to their ship. It seems to give her a little additional importance. They feel also that they have among them one to whom they may apply for information on many points on which, from their mode of life, they are ignorant, but which will frequently occur in the course of conversation. The presence of the Chaplain seems also often to remind them of the endearments of home, and the ties of family connections; for they take a pleasure to make it known to him that they have a father, a brother, &c., in the Church. His presence serves, too, to put a salutary check on the pleasures of the table, and prevents an undue freedom in conversation—though this latter is far from being as prevalent among naval officers of the present day, as the gentlemen and gentlewomen "of

* Any one taking an interest in the subject of naval antiquities may consult the work of Teonge, a Naval Chaplain of Charles the Second's reign: an exceedingly curious book. It was by no means scarce some years back, and is, we believe, to be found in the British Museum, and elsewhere.

England, who live at home at ease," are apt to imagine it to be; and we are firmly of opinion, that there is a marked superiority in the conversation and manners of those messes which have a Chaplain as one of their members, as well as of those officers who, when young, were under his instruction. This is a *fact* which *careful observation* has fully convinced us of.

A sea life is at best a life of privation; and a Naval Chaplain must naturally have his share of it. He is alone, as it were, in the midst of a busy world; he has no one of his own profession, as all around him have, with whom to converse; even the technical phrases which ever and anon meet his ear are, for some considerable period, as unintelligible to him as the language of the Hottentots; it may be years before he meets with any one of his own cloth: his necessary and only companions are those who have been accustomed to "the faithless sea" from their infancy, while he enters the service when it is all but too late to alter his habits so as to accommodate them to his new mode of life, without in some measure compromising his character as a Minister of the Gospel. Great *tact*, as well as knowledge of men and manners, is absolutely requisite to be combined with genuine religious feeling, if he would win the esteem, as well as the due respect, of them with whom he has to deal. If his conduct is governed by such principles as these, nothing can be more gratifying than the deep sense of respect with which the sailors, strange beings as they are considered, regard him. Seamen have, as a body, a high sense of religion, and are extremely attentive to the Church service. "Many's the time and oft" that we have known the tears trickle down their weather-beaten cheeks, while they were listening, in mute attention, to the delivery of a sermon on the death of some companion, snatched from them in a moment, with all his sins fresh upon him. And innumerable and most interesting opportunities, of these and similar sorts, are constantly presented amidst the vicissitudes of naval life, which the Chaplain has it in his power to improve for strengthening his influence and deepening any impressions he may have made.

Whether, however, he can ever succeed in obtaining sufficient moral influence to prevent the introduction of females of improper character on board ships in harbour, has perhaps scarcely, as yet, been sufficiently proved. We believe that much is capable of being done by him, even in this respect; but the subject is at once a delicate and a difficult one. None but those well acquainted with it, know its peculiar difficulties. It is one, however, well worthy of attention. Sir Jahleel Brenton has some judicious remarks on it ("Hope of the Navy," p. 277).

As regards the whole subject under review, the conclusions to which we have been led, in the course of our enquiry, are briefly these. That the Army can scarcely be more destitute of spiritual superintendence than it is,* with the exception of that portion of it serving in India, where the Ecclesiastical arrangements are, of course, made by the East India Company.† That the Navy is tolerably provided even now, but that the present machinery might be rendered much more efficient. That the two general points to be kept in view, in both Army and Navy are, the holding out sufficient inducements, first to incline respectable and useful Clergymen to enter, and then, when entered, to secure a continuance of their services.

The deficiency of the Army in pastoral superintendence is so great and so glaring that, in matters of spiritual provision, it presents us with an aspect so nearly approaching to no aspect at all, or, in other words, to a general blank, as positively to leave us almost without one single particular point upon which to comment for the amelioration of that branch of the service.

As regards the improvement of the Navy, the particular points to be regarded are—the providing ships with Chaplains, to the full extent enjoined by the naval regulations‡—the careful selection of the individuals to serve—the providing, as far as possible, for the regular performance of divine service—the

* We are happy to find, however, that there is now a Chapel for the troops at Edinburgh, in which service of some kind (we believe presbyterian) is regularly performed; and that Mr. Murray, the Minister of the North Parish, in Aberdeen, receives thirty pounds a-year for paying some attention to the troops there in garrison, the 93rd, whose depôt is now quartered there, being one of the six regiments entitled to the services of a Presbyterian Chaplain. We understand, however, that when regiments have been quartered there, of which the great body were Episcopalians, much complaint has been made, that no Clergyman was provided for them.

† We have already spoken highly of these, but we may mention, moreover, another regulation, which the Company have recently adopted, to increase the number of Military Chaplains in India. They have created a number of junior chaplaincies, at lower salaries than the original ones (we believe 500*l.* a-year); the juniors to be regularly promoted, as vacancies occur, to the senior. This is an excellent way of combining an increase in the efficiency of the establishment, with a due regard to economy.

‡ The “Hastings” had no Chaplain, while taking the late Lord Durham out to Canada. The “Hercules” had no Chaplain, for some months previous to her being last paid off. The “Inconstant” had none, for many months previous to her being last paid off also. The other ships unprovided, according to the latest returns, are—Blonde, 42, East Indies; Druid, 44, ditto; Poictiers, 72, Chatham; Revenge, 76, Lisbon; Thunderer, 84, Plymouth. We should like to know, moreover, why none of the 26’s are provided with Chaplains, since they all come, as well as the “Niagara” (20), on the lakes of Canada, within the terms of the regulations, which enjoin that they shall be provided

giving to the Chaplain a position at once better defined,* and more in accordance with the elevated character of his profession—and the arranging for him some better means of privacy and seclusion than that which he at present enjoys.

The last great thing to be kept in view is, the impartial distribution of the rewards of faithful service, and the thereby holding out inducements to men to continue after they have served their eight years, got over their sea-sickness, and felt their footing in their profession: without this, men will always be likely to leave just about the time that their services are be-

with them. The only excuse can be a pretended want of accommodation, which might, nevertheless, be easily supplied. The following is a list of this class of vessels, with their stations, thus left unprovided:—

Alligator, Australia.
Andromache, Portsmouth.
Calliope, South America.
Carysfort, Mediterranean.
Cleopatra, North America and West Indies.
Conway, East Indies.
Crocodile, North America and West Indies.

Curacoa, South America.
Excellent, Portsmouth.
Magicienne, ditto.
North Star, Particular Service.
Talbot, Mediterranean.
Tyne, ditto.
Vestal, North America and West Indies.
Volage, China.

* So little were Captains, at times, aware of the distinction between the authority which they possessed as the Commanders of their respective ships, and that spiritual jurisdiction which, of course, can only be exercised over a Clergyman through his ecclesiastical superior, that not only have we heard of some who have had the assumption to attempt to dictate to the Chaplain what doctrines he should preach; but we have it in our power to record a more amusing, but even perhaps, still more mischievous overstepping of the boundaries of all prescribed authority, on the part of the dignitary magnanimous in the possession of epaulettes of the *bivalve* order. We allude to the case of Sir J. P., who evidently appears to have assumed that a Captain in the Navy was at least equal to one Archbishop, two Bishops, together with Presbyters *ad libitum*; since he regularly [?] appointed the Chaplain of his ship a Bishop; and sent him on shore under a salute of eighteen guns, to consecrate a Protestant church at, we believe, St. Michael's, or some one of the Azores. What may be thought of the conduct of the Clergyman who acquiesced in this absurd mock elevation, we do not pretend to determine. He may possibly have had the excuse of a difficulty, under the circumstances, in disobeying orders, which, ridiculous as they were, it might have been an awkward thing for him to have disobeyed. The blame must therefore necessarily lie at the door of the thoughtless individual by whom the orders were given. It is but fair however to mention, that this person was generally considered in the service as not a little "cracked." Amongst other anecdotes of his eccentricities we have been told, that when an order came down for all officers above a certain rank to wear cocked hats, as the colour was not specified, he thought proper to make his appearance in a *white* one. On another occasion he applied for leave of absence when his ship was actually under sailing orders: the reply from the Admiralty was, that he might go as far as he could go in his gig (which, we need scarcely inform any of our readers, meant in that case a four, or more probably, a six-oared boat). Upon this, our eccentric Commander immediately had his gig put upon wheels, after the fashion of its shore-going relative, and drove four-in-hand triumphantly up to town, and straight into the awful precincts of the Admiralty!

coming most valuable. We have already suggested the endowing the Army with so many benefices, to be the rewards of long and faithful service on the part of its Chaplains. The Navy is already so provided. There are sixteen or more pieces of preferment, ranging between 170*l.* to five or six hundred a-year, which it is always understood shall be given to the senior Chaplains, or at least to such as peculiarly distinguish themselves by arduous service. On this latter score, Mr. Fisher, who went to the North Pole with Captain Parry, was very properly preferred, though comparatively a young man; and his promotion over the heads of his seniors gave no offence to any one, as he was felt to have fairly earned it. We are sorry to say, however, that in other cases, when the order of seniority has been departed from, interest rather than merit has carried the day. This ought not to be allowed for a moment. What can be more disheartening to a man who has spent the best of his days in the service, than to see interest prevailing over the claims of laborious desert, to rob him of the hard-earned retirement of his declining years? But were a fair inducement held out, as it might be, to men to continue in the service, were they placed in their proper position when entered upon it, were the improvements which we have been proposing, and others which it might be easy to suggest, adopted and strenuously carried out into practice, then might we hope, under the blessing of God, to live to witness the dawning of a bright day indeed for our Navy.

We cannot conclude this article without a few words as to the means which are now in progress for relieving the necessities, bodily as well as spiritual, of our seamen generally, as well of the merchant service as of the Navy. Sir Jahleel Brenton's "Appeal" is a well-written little book, containing an interesting description of that most excellent united institution, the Sailor's Home and Destitute Sailor's Asylum, Well-street, London Docks:—

"To meet the varied and urgent cases of distress and imposition which have been detailed, the establishment of a Destitute Sailor's Asylum was suggested. Its commencement was attended with many difficulties; other scenes of misery had been pressing upon the community, and effort after effort made to relieve them; every source of charity appeared to be exhausted; but, in despite of all discouragement, two Captains, George Gambier and R. Elliot, of the Navy, nobly came forward, and upon their own responsibility, and, in the first instance, almost upon their own funds, began, upon a small scale, an undertaking which has since grown into an institution of great and increasing importance.

"It has already been observed that the distress experienced among the seamen in 1827 was very great; that they were seen wandering

almost naked and famishing about the streets, in the eastern part of the metropolis, during the bitter nights of that winter, or crowded together at the grated window of a glass-house, endeavouring to procure warmth ; whilst others found a wretched shelter in uninhabited houses or ruins. That this is no exaggerated account is but too well known to the magistrates and police officers of that day.

“ The benevolent individuals above-mentioned endeavoured at once to meet this deplorable state of things. They immediately set on foot a subscription amongst their friends, and hired an old warehouse, which happened to be then vacant, in Dock-street, in which they commenced their plan in the humblest style. At first they could only offer the shelter of the roof, giving to each applicant a very small sum to procure him bread ; but, by degrees, the building obtained an appearance of comfort and cleanliness, was furnished below, with a stove, cooking apparatus, and benches ; and above, in the loft, with a quantity of clean straw and old canvass, which made bedding for the inmates.

“ At five in the morning, to use our professional jargon, the hands were turned up, and they received a comfortable breakfast of hot porridge, or *bergue*, as it is called, with biscuit ; then a portion of the morning service of the Church and two chapters of the Scriptures were read to them ; after which they were sent out to endeavour to obtain employment, either by getting into a merchant-vessel, or by working in the docks, or other parts of the banks of the river. They generally continued absent during the day, unless driven in by wet weather, and at six in the evening again mustered, and received a good substantial hot supper, consisting of soup, beef, and biscuit ; at seven, a Minister of the Gospel came, performed divine service, and addressed them in an appropriate discourse ; after which they retired to their homely, but, to them, most comfortable bed. An extra meal on Sunday was given to them between churches.

“ No swearing or improper language was tolerated, and the pain of expulsion enforced against those who were guilty ; nor could the offender be received again until he renewed his claim by another voyage to sea and another relapse into misery. It was delightful to witness the harmony and peaceful enjoyment experienced here by these destitute sailors, with as much cleanliness as their forlorn state would admit of ; and as one of the most active managers of this truly noble undertaking most strikingly observed, ‘ there appeared to be a feeling of seriousness, though not of uncheerfulness among the men, while within the walls of the asylum, that shewed the effect which an habitual recognition of the presence of God has upon the minds even of those who have lived long without Him in the world.’

“ Thus much, as regards the destitute seaman ; but the benefit of the institution does not stop with him ; it is materially felt throughout our maritime service, to which it has returned many an useful member, who otherwise have been lost to it and to the country.

“ Amongst the evils to which the seafaring man is exposed, that of crimping stands very prominent : it is carried on to a most abominable extent, not only in London but in all our sea-ports, and by the most iniquitous means. It is hardly necessary to explain, that a c imp is a

man who engages to furnish crews to merchant vessels fitting out for a voyage.

"There are men to whom the seaman may safely apply when he wants employment; but the crimp is one who seeks for *him*, who follows, or perhaps leads him into all the haunts of dissipation and vice, to intoxication, extravagance, and consequent distress, for the very purpose of making him a marketable commodity, and keeping him in bondage till he can dispose of him to advantage. The crimps are paid for manning a ship in the East India Company's service, in sums varying from 50*l.* to 200*l.*, according to circumstances; his principal gain, however, arises from the extortion he practises upon his victim. But it is not only the extortion which the sailor experiences at the hand of the crimp, that is to be deplored and guarded against: he is frequently led by him to conduct involving the most disastrous consequences to his whole future life. I allude, particularly, to desertion from the Navy.

"The truly benevolent founders of the Destitute Sailor's Asylum conceived the happy idea, that it might not only be possible to relieve distress when found to exist, but to prevent its occurrence, in a great measure, by providing a home for the sailor, to which he might resort after his voyage, deposit his wages, his chest, and bedding, and, having all his wants supplied at a moderate expense, be enabled to wait for future employment, and kept out of the clutches of those who are leagued for his destruction, and who make their living by it.

"On entering the Sailor's Home, the applicant for admission finds a savings' bank, in which he may at once deposit his money in safety, and in legal security, from whence he may draw it out at pleasure, on giving the due notice.

"Each inmate of the institution has a comfortable bed-room to himself, and a place where he may deposit his property in safety—has four meals a day, good in quality, and abundant in quantity—he pays 14*s.* for one week's board and lodging, or 2*s.*, by the day, for any less time. The day begins and is ended in prayer, at which all who are in the house are expected to attend, and have generally done so with the utmost cheerfulness. As little restraint as possible is imposed upon them; cleanliness, sobriety, and morality, are expected and enforced as far as may be; the health of the people attended to; and if any are in want of medical assistance it is procured for them, or should they be seriously ill, they are sent to the Dreadnought hospital-ship."

We trust that this invaluable institution will continue to meet with the support which it so largely deserves.* We have no hesitation in saying, that by this vast maritime empire, the wel-

* It is now in contemplation to build a new church, chiefly for sailors, in the immediate neighbourhood of the institution. The Bishop of London has expressed himself highly favourable to the erection; and the only stoppage appears to be the expense of obtaining ground. There are highly suitable sites obtainable in the immediate neighbourhood of Well-street, and we certainly think that the dock companies ought to come forward in liberal support of the undertaking.

fare of her sailors, both temporal and spiritual, ought never to be received in any other light than that of an object of the highest national import. And we have equally little fear of contradiction when we affirm, that this admirable institution is the very one of all others to promote that object—to carry out, to the fullest extent, the illustrious benefits which we are entitled to believe will be the result of its labours. The names of Captains Elliot and Pierce, and of Sir William Dunbar, the Chaplain, are of themselves sufficient guarantee for the character of the superintendence which is there exercised over our seamen; and we sincerely wish these devoted and excellent individuals God speed in their high and holy work. We are about to erect a column to the memory of the greatest naval hero the world ever saw, and right well it is that we should build such a monument to his fame; but could the spirit of the departed warrior be permitted to revisit the scenes of time, it would be near such an edifice as this that it would most love to hover, as the spot where seamen may be taught both how to live and how to die.

We often hear of those who have fallen in the arms of victory, and who, lulled in glory's lap to rest, have slept peacefully beneath the sod; whilst a grateful country, which they gave their lives to defend, has gathered their ashes into marble urns, and enrolled their names with the illustrious dead. And those names have been borne on the tongue of posterity, familiar as household words; and painting has blazoned their triumphs; and sculpture has fixed them in the living rock; and poetry has decked them with the lustre, and crowned them with the halo of song. And we love the memory of the departed brave, and we move with more slow and measured tread as we approach their tombs, and we bless the sod that forms the warrior's pillow, and enshrine in our hearts the names of the sepultured mighty. But while we thus pay a due tribute to those who sleep the warrior's sleep, and honour the brave who shed their blood for their country, whether by land or sea, still must we never cease to remember that the rest of the departed soldier of the cross is a yet more illustrious thing—that he is the true hero who sleeps in the arms of victory.

Earth knew not his conflict; she marked not his tread in her blood-bedewed soil, and her down-trodden harvests, and smoking villages, and plundered cities, and waters red with gore. The field of warfare was in the deep recesses of the lonely spirit. There was none of the "confused noise," and the "garments rolled in blood," which marked the battle of the warrior; but yet the struggle was desperate, and the conflict unceasing. 'Twas a conflict with those with whom peace would be ruin, and com-

promise destruction. 'Twas the tug of that desperate mortal strife, in which one of the antagonists is doomed, and there could be no slumbering on the arms—no cessation from the war. Then how great the character of that repose in which such a conflict has ceased, and ceased for ever! How sweet the sleep of the warrior, after such a day of battle and alarms!

And though he may have been unknown to the world, and have passed away in obscurity, perhaps in heart-rending poverty, and amidst the grim loneliness of desertion “unwept and unsung;” yet not “unhonoured” was he. He was a king, a conqueror, passing through earth’s scenes in disguise. And whilst no solemn dirge was chaunted at his obsequies, and no long train of mourners thronged around his coffin, and no heraldic pomp and blazonry was there; yet was the scene honoured by the presence of an innumerable company of angels, and the admiring gaze of the Church of the first-born. And there was a requiem for the departing spirit, though no mortal voices chaunted the strain; and the words were, “Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.” Such is the repose which we would have sought after by the intrepid children of the sea. We would have them, in a word, taught to become fit to die; and not only fit to die, but fit to live. Who ought to be our best missionaries to foreign lands? Our sailors! Who ought to be the bearers, through the habitable globe, of the light of God’s truth, and the messages of his love to fallen man? Who, but the very individuals whose neglected condition has too much made them hitherto the ministers of all unrighteousness—the disgrace of Christianity—the scandal of civilization. Thank God that such men as we have named are earnestly employed in removing this stigma from our country—the stigma of a great Christian nation—sending forth men bearing the Christian name, to pollute the morals of the very heathen in the darkest corners of the globe. From the results of their labours, if properly seconded, in dependence upon God’s good blessing, we shall look in firm confidence for the approach of a new and delightful order of things; when crews from the Sailor’s Home shall go forth with the Bible in their hands, and its precepts in their hearts, as so many pioneers, to prepare the way of the Lord. That thus greatly through their indirect agency, the waters which, small in their issuings, are evermore proceeding from under the threshold of the sanctuary, shall go on and continue to rise, till the whole earth be deluged with their glory, and the Sun of Righteousness shall look down from above, and behold his own image reflected in the flood.

ART. VI.—*The Whole Works of the Rev. Joseph Bingham, including Origines Ecclesiasticæ, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church, carefully collected ; with the quotations in the original languages at length, instead of merely the references, as formerly given ; a new set of Maps of Ecclesiastical History ; and Life of the Author.* 9 vols 8vo. London : William Straker.

FOR many years the attention of Christians has been directed to the subject of Jewish Antiquities, while those of the Christian Church have, to a most culpable extent, been neglected. The former have formed the subjects of lectures, and of volumes of no ordinary size, while the latter have been passed by as unworthy of notice. Nay, the very study of *Christian Antiquities* has not unfrequently been branded with the odious name of popery, and the pursuit itself as suited only to those who are living within the pale of the Romish Church. When we speak of *Christian Antiquities*, we allude to matters much more ancient than popery. It is true that some of these ancient things have been retained in the Church of Rome, nor are they the less worthy of our regard from that circumstance; but, on the other hand, it is equally true, that the Romish Church has so added to the ancient things of the Christian Church, that *they* are lost amid her additions. It is difficult to separate the new from the old ; while the former attract the attention to the entire exclusion of the latter. The antiquities of the Christian Church are common property ; they belong alike to all Churches ; and because popery has abused some things, we are not to be deterred from appropriating to our own use those things which we can prove to have been practised by the early Church. Nor can the charge of popery lie at our door, if we strip off the additions which Rome has made to some ceremonies, and adopt them in their original form and character. Such a plan was pursued at the Reformation, by the men whom the Lord raised up in England for the express purpose of restoring his Church to her pristine state. Those wise and holy men pursued their course with undeviating firmness, regardless alike of the cavils of the *Papist* and the *Puritan*. They did not reject a ceremony because it had been abused, nor did they retain those additions which popery, during a long succession of ages, had gradually introduced.

A new era has, we believe, commenced with regard to this study. At one time few persons paid any attention to the subject ; but at the present moment, most of the clergy and large numbers of the laity, are entering upon it. The age of the Reformation may thus be revived ; for the Reformers, as is evident

from their writings, were deeply versed therein. Had the case, indeed, been otherwise, the Reformation in England might have been conducted on the principles on which it was managed in Scotland and on the continent; where little regard was paid to the voice of antiquity, and where the fact of the reception of a ceremony by the Church of Rome was quite sufficient to ensure its rejection, even though no doubt existed respecting its early and apostolic origin.

The great work of Bingham, published at the early part of the last century, has been a vast storehouse, from which all writers on Christian Antiquities have most largely drawn. There are two old editions of the work; the one in ten volumes *octavo*, the other in two volumes *folio*. In the *folio* edition, the other works of the learned author are also comprised. A few years ago there was published a handsome edition in eight volumes *octavo*, which was exhausted within a much less space than could have been anticipated with so large a work. The fact, however, that an edition of such a book was sold off within a few years, proves that the study had become much more general. Within our own recollection, the *folio* edition of Bingham was easily to be procured; but now, not only is that edition become extremely scarce, but a new edition even has been exhausted, and another actually called for by the public.

We feel constrained to perform an act of justice to Mr. Straker, the spirited publisher of the present edition. Every one in the least acquainted with the publishing department, must be aware that no small outlay is requisite to bring out a large work like Bingham.

It may be necessary, before we enter upon the subject of our present investigation, to state the peculiar merits of the present edition. In the older ones the passages from ancient authors are merely referred to in the margin, or at the foot of the page; in the present they are given at length. To the student of ecclesiastical Antiquities, this is an advantage of no ordinary character. Many persons, whose habits lead them to the pursuit of such inquiries, are unable to refer to the works themselves, from which the author has derived his materials; and though Bingham's accuracy may always be taken for granted, yet the student feels a pleasure in perusing the passages in the words of their original authors. It is scarcely possible for any man to consult all the authors referred to in this learned and voluminous work, unless he happens to reside in the vicinity of our public libraries, an advantage which falls to the lot of but few of those who take up the subject of Church History and Christian Antiquities.

There is also another disadvantage under which the student

labours in reading such works as those of Bingham, when the references only are given. The book and the page of an author may be quoted, but not the edition; and the student, therefore, even though he may possess the works of the author in question, may not possess the edition to which the reference refers. In such circumstances he cannot find the passages upon which the statements of his author are founded, and thus the references become useless. By giving the passages at length in the margin, every difficulty is avoided.

Besides the quotations, there are several maps illustrative of the subjects discussed in the work. On the whole, therefore, this edition may be viewed as one of the most valuable contributions which, in an age fruitful in new and well-edited editions of old works, have been presented to the public. The work ought to find its way into the collection of every clergyman.

On such a subject we cannot be expected to do more than select a few topics for observation, leaving our readers to pursue the inquiry in the laborious work to which our previous observations refer. It would have been well for the peace of the Church if discord and division had never been known within her pale: but, alas! on this very subject of Christian Antiquities, what rancour and bitterness, what reproaches and revilings have been engendered amongst those who profess to receive the same scriptures, to follow the same Saviour, and to hope to enter the same heavenly country after the journey of life is terminated. If we could enumerate all the evils that have arisen from the divisions of the Christian Church, the catalogue would be most appalling. At the present time she is divided respecting the practices of the primitive Christians. By one party, perhaps, certain ceremonies are made too important: by another, *all* primitive practices are rejected. The consequences are just what might be expected; namely, the triumph and exaltation of the common enemy. The Infidel and the Papist alike rejoice at the scenes which are frequently witnessed in the bosom of our own Church. *Bella hereticorum Pax Ecclesiæ*, said a champion of popery: nor can the truth of the assertion be denied. On the contrary, we have the testimony of experience in its favour. The divisions of Christians have been the reproach of heathens and Mahometans. When a Turkish emperor was told that the Christians would at last unite against him, *he lifted up his hand, and, stretching out his fingers, replied, that there was no more ground for expecting such a combination, than for fearing that those fingers should grow together!* Josephus attributes the desolation brought upon Jerusalem by the Romans to the divisions of the Jewish nation;

and the dissensions raised in Africa by the Donatists were the occasion of infinite calamities to the Church.* Nor can any one deny that the divisions among Protestants tend very materially to foster the errors of popery in the minds of many who might otherwise be inclined to quit the Church of Rome altogether. For our part, we purpose to steer a middle course between the opposite extremes: we shall endeavour to ascertain some of the practices of the apostolic age; and we shall point out their importance to us at the present time. We contend, that anything which can be proved to be of apostolic origin has the strongest claim upon our attention; and unless some valid reason can be assigned for its rejection, ought to be observed; for the presumption is, that whatever was *enjoined* and practised by the apostles, was enjoined by a divine command, not, indeed, written, but made known to those by whom the practice was instituted. We speak with some reservation on this point. Generally speaking, we should be disposed to contend that the practices of the apostolic age are binding on the Christian Church, inasmuch as they may be regarded as of divine appointment: but caution is necessary, because we find that some of the apostolic rites were subsequently, and by competent authority, discontinued. With this caution we may safely assert, that those practices which can be clearly traced to the time of the apostles, ought to be observed by Christians in every age of the Church.

The field upon which we are about to enter is a very extensive one; and though it has been largely cultivated by numbers, a rich and abundant harvest still remains to be gathered in.

Among the most important subjects of inquiry in the present day, may be ranked the question of Church Government. Soon after the Reformation, the point was keenly discussed by the friends of the Anglican Church, and by those who pleaded for a further reformation. At first the English Reformers appear to have regarded episcopacy as an apostolic institution, but not of divine appointment; that is, they did not conceive that it rested on any absolute command, though they considered it as the practice of the apostolic age. Into this subject we shall not now enter. It may be sufficient to state that the views of our Church, respecting this question, are sound and moderate. Our Reformers evidently viewed

* Baronius An. 303, n. 29. "Hæc sunt malorum exordia, et ex hoc fonte fluxerunt impii Donatistæ, quorum causa Africana Ecclesia tot cladibus fuit multis sæculis in pœnam exagitata, ac a Wandalis primò, demum ab Arabibus est penitus devastata."

episcopacy as the platform erected by the apostles for the government of the Church ; but they were too wise to assert that the Presbyterian form might not be *lawful* in cases of *necessity*. Its lawfulness, under any other circumstances, never was admitted by our Reformers : nor, indeed, with the evidence derived from antiquity open before them, was it possible to admit, that Presbyterian orders could ever be deemed valid, except when a *strong case of necessity* could easily be made out, as was the case with the Reformed Churches on the continent *at that time*.

Leaving, therefore, the question relative to the views of the Reformers on the subject of episcopacy, we shall proceed to ascertain the evidence in its favour from Christian Antiquity. And, first, with regard to *Bishops*. It is admitted that Bishops have ever existed in the Christian Church, and that they were rulers and governors : but it is contended by some, that their elevation above simple Presbyters was not a divine, but merely a human appointment, for the convenience of the Church. Before the close of the second century, episcopacy existed as a distinct order. That the appointment is divine, in the sense of a positive and express injunction of the Word of God, is not asserted : but if by a divine appointment, is merely intended an appointment by the apostles of our Lord, acting under their Lord's directions, then episcopacy *is* a Divine institution, and binding on the Christian world.

For this form of Church government we have the fullest and the strongest evidence from antiquity. If, therefore, the proof from scripture, that Bishops are superior to Presbyters, is incomplete, we conceive that the matter is settled by the voice of antiquity, taken in connexion with the testimony of the written word. Our views on this point are decided : nor do we feel that there is any room for doubt. Should it be said, that by giving expression to such views we pass judgment on all those Churches who have rejected episcopacy, we simply reply, that we do no such thing ; since we have already admitted that cases of necessity may arise, when the regular and appointed course, in the government of the Church, must be departed from.

In the first ages the Church of Christ was divided into two parts ; namely, rulers and those who were governed. Origen and Jerome, indeed, divide the whole body of Christians into five classes—Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons (constituting the priesthood), and believers, and catechumens. In later times the schoolmen, whose object was to make all Bishops dependent on the Roman pontiff, endeavoured to diminish the power of the episcopal order, by inventing the scheme, which in modern times

has acquired so many advocates—that the Presbyter and the Bishop were the same order, differing only in degree; or that the presbytery was a degree of the same order as episcopacy. Such a distinction was unknown in the ancient Church; and was evidently invented for the purpose of exalting the papacy. The pope claimed the power to constitute Bishops all over the world, viewing them as *no more* than his curates. With this end in view (namely, the diminution of the power of the Bishops), the pope from time to time deprived them of their just rights, exempting the monasteries from their jurisdiction, and making them dependent on himself, so that the monks became his devoted servants. It was for the same purpose that the popes permitted, nay instructed, many of the schoolmen to employ their talents in reducing the Bishops to mere Presbyters, except at the pleasure of the Roman pontiff. In the Council of Trent the Italian party laboured hard to prevent the recognition of the divine right of episcopacy.

Even the champions of Presbytery admit that Bishops were everywhere in the Church within forty years after the last of the apostles had quitted the earth: and if this be admitted, we cannot see how episcopacy could have been an innovation. How indeed, could it have been introduced so soon after the death of the apostles? Would it not have been opposed by numbers if it had been contrary to apostolic practice? And yet we find no trace of any opposition whatever. If the appointment of Bishops was a deviation from the apostolic practice, the deviation was universal, even according to the admissions of the advocates of Presbytery; and it is unreasonable to suppose that such a change could take place at one and the same time all over the Christian world, without being noticed in the writings of the period, or being handed down by tradition. To episcopal government may, therefore, be applied the well-known rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, a rule which cannot be applied to the traditions of popery—“*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*”*

* On this subject we cannot refrain from quoting the words of a most able author, whose learned work has just been reprinted under the editorial management of Mr. Allport:—“This common consent of Christians making up universal tradition, we have in what is unanimously delivered by the ancient fathers, and declared in the *first general councils* of those more holy and sincere primitive times. Thither I go to take up my belief, as to streams immediately proceeding from the fountain of grace, with more pleasure and satisfaction than to the muddy waters of doctrine delivered by the Church of Rome in this corrupt age, which has passed through so many hands defiled with ambition, avarice, and other earthly passions repugnant to sincerity; and of this, indeed, we have assurance more than enough.”—*See the True Catholic Faith Maintained in the Church of England*, by Andrew Sall. A new edition, revised by the Rev.

We are aware that Dissenters contend that nothing is to be received in the Church for which the express sanction and warrant of Holy Scripture cannot be adduced. It need scarcely be observed, that by this rule the Dissenters are condemned in many of their practices; and not only do they condemn themselves, but the whole Christian church. Let us take for our examples, or for illustrations of our positions, the observance of the Christian Sabbath and Infant Baptism. It is no where specified in the New Testament that the Jewish Sabbath was abolished, yet what Christian continues to observe it? Nor is it specified that the first day of the week should be set apart as the sabbath instead of the *seventh*, yet what Christian observes the *seventh* day? All professing Christians observe the *first* day of the week; not, however, because its observance is enjoined in Scripture, but because it has been observed in all ages of the Church. And with regard to the Baptism of Infants, the greater number of professing Christians adopt the practice; not, however, because they have any express command in Scripture, but because they have reason to believe that the practice was instituted by the apostles, and has been continued in the Christian Church from that time down to the present moment. Now we have more abundant testimonies for episcopal government than for either of the observances to which we have alluded; so that if episcopacy is rejected from want of evidence of its apostolical character, Infant Baptism and the Christian Sabbath must be rejected also.

It may be remarked, that it was not likely that the precise mode of governing the Church should be specified in the New Testament, for the Acts of the Apostles, in which these matters are mentioned, was written a considerable time before the apostles ceased to govern the Church. It was not probable, therefore, that they would commit such things to writing in that book, while they themselves were alive to administer the affairs of the Church according to the directions of their divine Master. We are told by Irenæus, that Polycarp was appointed to the episcopal office by the apostles themselves. Ignatius also was elevated to the same dignity by the same means. The testimonies respecting his appointment to the episcopal office are numerous, and such as cannot be reasonably disputed. Origen informs us, that he succeeded St. Peter in the see of Antioch. Athanasius mentions that he was created Bishop of Antioch after the apostles; while we have the testimony of Irenæus that he was conversant with the apostles, that he was nourished up

J. Allport, Minister of St. James's, Birmingham. p. 335. London. 1840. Mr Allport deserves the thanks of the public for republishing Sall's very able work, and also for his own learned and useful notes.

with them, and by them was deemed worthy of such great power. The same father, Irenæus, further testifies, that Ignatius was appointed to the office of Bishop, by the act of the apostles. In his genuine epistles, written so early, Ignatius himself speaks of Bishops as governors of the Church, and Presbyters as subject to the Bishops. This testimony is so decisive, that in our opinion there is no room for doubt on the subject; and the testimony of Ignatius is supported by the concurring voice of all antiquity. We have, therefore, the undoubted testimony of Ignatius, that Bishops and Presbyters were distinct orders in the Church, in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles; can it, therefore, be a question of doubt, whether such an arrangement was made in the apostolic age, and by the apostles themselves?

But here again we may be met with the cavil—"then you unchurch all the reformed Churches which have rejected episcopacy." To such an objection it would be sufficient to reply, that we have nothing to do with consequences; that we have established our position, and that we cannot be considered as responsible for any conclusions respecting other Churches, which objectors may adduce as naturally resulting from our premises. We are not, however, compelled to resort to such an answer, though in itself amply sufficient; for we have already admitted the plea of necessity in the case of the foreign Churches. We admit that even an apostolic institution may be departed from on such a ground; and that such a plea was a just one at the time of the Reformation, will be allowed by all competent judges: how far it is applicable to Presbyterian Churches in the present day it is not for us to determine.

In treating of the subject of Christian Antiquities, there is one order of men in the early Church which we cannot pass over without notice, and which we should gladly see revived in the present day. We allude to the order of *suffragan Bishops*. At an early period, Bishops were placed in certain towns and villages in the larger dioceses, to whom was applied the title *Chorepiscopi*. They were subject to the Bishop of the diocese, without whose permission they could not perform any episcopal act: they were, in fact, assistants to the diocesan. It seems that the order was abolished in the ninth century, when the power of the pope was carried to such an exorbitant pitch, that no arrangement was permitted to exist except such as proceeded from the sole will of the Roman pontiff.

Suffragan Bishops differ in some respects from the ancient *Chorepiscopi*; but it is probable, that the office of the former was suggested by the latter. In ancient times, all the Bishops in a province were designated suffragans to the metropolitans.

Thus the Bishops in the provinces of Canterbury and York are suffragans to our two metropolitans. But when the labours of the Bishops become so great that the care of a diocese was too much for one man, *coadjutors* were appointed under the name of *suffragans*. They were employed by the diocesan Bishops as their assistants, and acted under their authority; they could consecrate churches, ordain priests and deacons, and confirm. These suffragans are recognized by the statute of the 26th year of King Henry VIII., and by the same statute they derived their titles from some town in the diocese in which they acted. Thus we read of the suffragan of Dover, the suffragan of Bedford, and of several other places. Previous to the statute in question, the assistant Bishops were merely titular Bishops, without any designation from English towns. The statute was repealed in the *first* year of Queen Mary; but it was revived in the *first* year of Elizabeth; so that it is still in force, and there is nothing to prevent it from being acted on even in the present day.

It is clear, from the statute in question, that assistant Bishops were common in England long before the time of Henry VIII. As the statute is still in force, any Bishop could procure the appointment of a suffragan to assist him in the labours of his diocese. Of course he could only act as the diocesan's deputy. It appears that when a Bishop was anxious to nominate a suffragan, he mentioned two clergymen to the King, by whom one was selected for the office, after which he was duly consecrated by the Metropolitan and certain other Bishops.

The following table will shew the number of suffragans, according to the statute of Henry VIII., revived in the *first* year of Queen Elizabeth, and never repealed. The *first* column contains the name of the diocese, the *second* the places from which the *suffragans* derived their titles in each diocese:—

Dioceses.	Suffragan Titles.	Dioceses.	Suffragan Titles.
Canterbury,	Dover.		Bedford
London	Colchester	Lincoln	Leicester
	Guildford.		Grantham
Winchester {	Southampton		Huntingdon
	Isle of Wight	Norwich.....	Thetford
Bath & Wells {	Taunton		Ipswich
	Bridgewater		Shaftesbury
Bristol	Bristol	Salisbury ...	Molton
Litchfield and }	Shrewsbury		Marlborough
Coventry.....		York	Nottingham
Ely.....	Cambridge		Hull
Exeter	St. Germain's	Durham	Berwick
Gloucester	Gloucester	Carlisle	Penrith

When the act of Henry VIII. was passed, the sees of Bristol and Gloucester had not been created, and those cities were merely the titles of suffragans. From the foregoing tabular view it will be seen, that the law of the land actually provides for the appointment of *twenty-five* suffragan or assistant Bishops : nor is it to be denied, that their assistance would be highly beneficial in many of our dioceses. Some of them are of such large extent, that it is not possible for one man to attend to them properly ; and when it is considered that all our Bishops are required, by their duties in Parliament, to reside a considerable portion of the year in London, no churchman can fail to see the propriety of reviving the order of suffragans. How frequently, too, does it happen, that some of our prelates are laid aside by ill health ! Would it not be desirable, under such circumstances, to permit them to have a suffragan, who could act under the diocesan's authority ? Our Bishops are not like our Judges. When superannuated by old age or infirmity, the latter retire from the discharge of their judicial functions : but our Bishops cannot retire ; their office is of such a character that it cannot be relinquished. Suffragan Bishops are just as necessary as curates in extensive parishes : and it is just as impossible for one Bishop to attend to the affairs of an extensive diocese, as it is for one clergyman to minister to the wants of a large parish. There is a constant call for additional clergymen to attend to the increasing wants of the people : and surely it is reasonable to demand an additional number of Bishops. New sees need not be erected. Nothing more is required than to call into action that machinery which the Church still possesses.

Mr. Wharton has shown that, in the diocese of London alone, there were twenty-eight suffragan Bishops, between the years 1312 and 1540, and the statute of Henry VIII. was not only revived, but acted on by Queen Elizabeth : for, during her reign, we meet with the names of several suffragan Bishops ; and as late as the reign of James I., in the year 1605, Dr. Stern was suffragan of Colchester, and suspended from his office for not appearing in the convocation.* In the declaration of King Charles II., 1660, there is a promise that suffragans should be appointed : " Because the dioceses, especially some of them, be thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragan Bishops in every diocese, as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work." Why might not the dean in each cathedral, or the archdeacon in each arch-deaconry, be constituted a suffragan Bishop for the diocese ? As a remuneration for the suffragans certain livings in each

* Synodus Anglicanus, p. 38.

diocese, in the patronage of the crown or the Bishop, might be selected. At all events there would be no great difficulty in providing means, as the individuals selected for the office would not, necessarily, be expected to live in a style beyond that of an ordinary clergyman, while the only expenses which would be incurred would be those arising from travelling in the execution of their office; and these could be either defrayed from the resources of the diocese, or the suffragan might be permitted to hold a second living on the condition of paying his own. We close this subject with an extract from the Act of Parliament, by which suffragans are still authorised :—

“ That every Archbishop or Bishop of this realm, for their own particular diocese, may and shall give such commission or commissions to every such Bishop suffragan, as shall be so consecrate by the authority of this act, as hath been accustomed by suffragans heretofore to have, or else such commission as shall by them be thought requisite, reasonable, or convenient. And that no such suffragan shall use any jurisdiction, ordinary, or episcopal power, otherwise, nor longer time than shall be limited by such commission to him to be given, as is aforesaid, upon pain to incur into the pains, losses, forfeitures, and penalties mentioned in the statute of provisions, made in the sixteenth year of King Richard II.”

Of the numerous subjects so learnedly discussed in the great work of Bingham, we can only select a few. Passing by, therefore, various other topics, we shall dwell, in the next place, on the character of the edifices used for divine worship, and especially on their consecration, or setting apart for the service of God. It appears that various names were applied to Christian edifices in early times. By the Greeks the word *Εκκλησια*, and by the Latins *Ecclesia* was used. *Domus Dei* was also a common name with the Latin Church, which corresponds with the Greek *κυριακον*: from which word are derived the Saxon *Kyrick* or *Kyrch*, the Scotch *Kirk* and the English *Church*.

During three centuries the Church was more or less in a state of persecution; so that the converts to Christianity were frequently compelled to meet in secret in dens and caves of the earth; but even then they met, as far as possible, in the same place. When Constantine embraced Christianity, the Roman empire comprehended within its vast extent the whole of the civilized world. The finger of divine Providence is distinctly seen in the circumstances connected with the Roman empire at that time. It was permitted to be thus extended, in order that, when the Emperor became Christian, the Gospel might find an easy introduction into all parts of the civilized world.

In the *fourth* century Churches were every where erected

and dedicated to the service of God. The empire was divided into *provinces*; these again into *dioceses*, in each of which a church was built, called in the present day the Cathedral church. Other divisions became necessary; so that a diocese was subdivided into several parts, which were designated *parishes*. In these *parishes* smaller churches were erected: and hence our *parish churches*. In our own country, parishes were first formed about the *seventh* century.

When a church was completed, it was solemnly dedicated to the service of Almighty God, a practice retained in the Church of England; for every church is duly consecrated by the Bishop before it can be used for public worship.* Such dedications were common among the Jews, and even with the heathens in their idolatrous temples. Prior to the age of Constantine, the churches could be only privately dedicated to the service of God: but as soon as he was converted to the faith of Christ, every church was solemnly consecrated according to an especial form appointed for that purpose. The Bishops were accustomed to assemble when a church was ready for consecration, and the Emperor Constantine himself took a part frequently in the ceremony. It was the special office of the Bishops in early times, as is still the case with us, to consecrate the edifices set apart for Christian worship. Usually the ceremony was performed on the day which was set apart in commemoration of some saint in the calendar, after whom the church was named. Gregory the Great introduced the custom of celebrating the dedication of churches annually, on which occasions the people erected booths round about the church, and feasted together, as they had been accustomed to do in their heathen sacrifices. It is from this custom, that what are termed *wakes*, *revels*, and *feasts* are derived, which are always held on the day on which the parish church was dedicated, or on the Sunday following. Every one knows how grossly these solemn seasons are abused by the people, being oftentimes devoted to the lowest kinds of debauchery. By a council held at Oxford, A.D. 1222, certain laws were enacted respecting the observance of festivals. Among these were mentioned the *feasts of dedication of churches*, which were to be observed with the same solemnities as other *festivals*. At a very early period, therefore, the *dedication feast* was annually celebrated in every parish on the day of the month on which the church was consecrated. Henry VIII., however, procured an Act of Parliament, A.D. 1536,

* A Bishop may grant his licence for divine worship, without consecration: but such places are merely of a temporary character.

to restrain the people in the observance of the festivals; which were become so numerous, that they interfered with the ordinary concerns of life, preventing the people from attending to their lawful occupations. By this Act it was enacted that the *dedication of churches* should be celebrated in all parishes on one particular day, the *first Sunday in October* for ever, and upon no other day. This act was not long observed. In all those parishes in which there was no memory of the day on which the church was consecrated, the dedication feast was observed on the *first Sunday* in October, which was the great day in the year. But wherever the people had a tradition respecting any particular day, as that on which their church was dedicated, the *Sunday* following was observed annually as the feast of the dedication. This practice still prevails in all parts of England and Wales. The Sunday after the day of the dedication of the church is still observed, at least in all our rural parishes.

It may seem somewhat singular that we have no authorized *form* for the consecration of our churches: yet such is the case, and our Bishops are at liberty to use any form which they may deem it right to adopt. Though, therefore, uniformity exists in all our churches in the public services, no discretionary power being permitted to the officiating minister, yet in the dedication of those churches to the service of God no *form* is prescribed. The consequence is that scarcely two Bishops use exactly the same form. In the main features, indeed, the forms are the same, but they differ in certain minute particulars. We have noticed this variety whenever we have attended on the solemn occasion of the dedication of a church.

When the Liturgy was compiled by our Reformers, there was no want of churches: consequently a *form* of consecration was not prepared. Had it been necessary, at that time, to erect new churches, this service would not have been overlooked any more than that for the consecration of Bishops, and the ordination of priests and deacons, which was one of the earliest acts of the Reformers. At length, however, churches were required in some places, and they were consecrated by the Bishops, with such ceremonies as they considered desirable. Bishop Andrews prepared a service, which he and some others used. It was used also, with some alterations, by Archbishop Laud in the consecration of the church of St. Catharine Cree, on which a charge was founded against him at his trial. This *form* was republished by Bishop Sparrow soon after the restoration; and it is usually found with his admirable work "A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England."

In the Convocation, A.D. 1662, by whom the Book of Common Prayer was revised and brought into its present form, the question was debated, and Cosin, who had been promoted to the bishopric of Durham, was instructed to prepare a suitable service to be adopted on all future occasions. The notices may be found in the acts of that Convocation :—

“ SESSIO LXXI.

“ DIE SABBATI 22 Martii, inter horas 8 et 10 ante meridiem ejusdem diei, &c., habito tractatu inter eos de speciali forma concipienda in et circa *Consecrationem Ecclesiarum Parochialium* et quarumcunque capellarum intra hoc regnum Angliæ, quoties et quodocunque evenerit eas benedicendas fore. Dictus Dominus Episcopus Londonis, &c., de et cum consensu confratrum suorum curam in et circa conceptionem formæ predictæ Reverendo Patri Domino Johanni permissione Divinâ Dunelmis Episcopo unanimiter commisit : et post alium tractatum, idem reverendus pater continuavit, &c., juxta schedulam, &c.”*

Some time after, the *form* was presented to the House, when it was referred to a committee of four Bishops for revision :—

“ SESSIO CVI.

“ DIE SABBATI 20 Junii, inter horas 8 et 10 ante meridiem, &c., præsentatâ substitutione Domini Præsiden', &c., eaque publice lectâ, forma consecrationis ecclesiarum et capellarum fuit per Presiden', &c. introducta ; et relata fuit curæ Reverendorum virorum Domini Roberti Humfridi Sarum, Roberti Lincoln', et Johannis Coven', et Lichen', respective episcoporum, pro diligenti revisione ejusdem.”†

Nothing was done in the way of revision, and the subject was dropped. The matter was resumed in 1689 by some of the Bishops and others who took an active part in the comprehension scheme : but as the parties of the day were so strongly opposed to each other, they were not able to decide, even upon a form for the consecration of churches.

In the year 1704, the chapel of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, was consecrated by Patrick, Bishop of Ely, who used, on that occasion, a form, in many respects different from that which had been prepared by Andrews, and re-published by Sparrow. This *form* was published, during the same year, with the Bishop's permission. A copy is now before us, but whether it was the usual form then in use we are not able to determine. It differs, however, very materially from any *form* which we have heard or seen within the last few years.

In the year 1712 a *form* was agreed upon by the Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation, by whom it was sent to the Lower House for their approval. It was altered by the Lower

* Synodus Anglicanus, 107.

† Ibid, 117, 118.

House in committee ; but as the royal assent was not granted, it possesses no greater authority than any other form. It is, however, the foundation of those forms which are used in the present day, each Bishop adopting it, with such alterations as he may choose to introduce. Our readers are aware that *fifty* new churches were built, in the reign of Queen Anne, in order to meet the wants of the increasing population of the metropolis. As some of these churches were nearly ready for consecration, the attention of the Convocation was naturally directed to the composition of a *form* for that solemnity. It was the intention of Convocation to get it authorized, with the Liturgy, for general use ; but, from some unexplained cause, the business was not prosecuted to a conclusion. Since that time no attempt has been made to introduce an authorized *form*. The new churches in Queen Anne's reign were, probably, consecrated according to the *form* in question : but still it possesses no authority, and every Bishop is at liberty to follow his own judgment in the consecration of a church or chapel.*

From certain incidental notices on the subject, it appears that the Bishops, after the Reformation, were accustomed to compose a particular prayer for the consecration of a church. It is probable that it was used in addition to the daily service. Thus King, Bishop of London, composed a consecration prayer, which he used in the year 1615, at the solemn dedication of a chapel at Edmington. The same *form*, which may be seen in Collier, was used in 1616, at the consecration of a chapel, by the Bishop of Chester, in the parish of Barking, in Essex.† We are not aware that any other printed *forms* are extant besides these which we have specified, namely, that used by Bishop King in 1615, Bishop Andrews's, Bishop Patrick's, and that which was set forth by Convocation in 1712.

The consecration of churches is one of the practices at which Dissenters cavil, perhaps more than at almost any other ; but in such a case, the custom of the early Church is certainly a safer guide than the opinions of men in the nineteenth century.

The use of catechisms and creeds in the early Church presents to us a most interesting subject of inquiry, and one which cannot fail to be useful in an age like the present, in which the evils resulting from the absence of creeds and confessions are so notorious in the case of many Dissenting bodies. When persons became candidates for baptism, they were called *Catechu-*

* This *form* was printed from the Journals of the House, in 1719, in "Lewis's Historical Essay on the Consecration of Churches."

† Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii. 709.

mens. These persons were instructed by the Church in the principles of the Christian religion, preparatory to their admission, by baptism, to all the privileges which the Church had to confer; they were examined from time to time, in order that their progress might be ascertained; they were taught the creed, and the Lord's Prayer, and to answer certain questions respecting the renunciation of the Devil, and covenanting with the Saviour. When the period of probation, which was longer or shorter, according to circumstances, was completed, they were admitted to the solemn rite of baptism. Certain classes of persons were excluded altogether from being candidates for baptism, so long as they continued to practice the prohibited things. Such were persons employed in making idols for heathen worship, stage-players, gladiators, wrestlers, astrologers, courtezans, and public singers. On renouncing their mode of life they might be received as catechumens, or candidates for baptism—not otherwise. Infants were admitted to baptism on being presented by their parents, whose consent was regarded as their own, until they arrived at years of discretion, when an opportunity was afforded of ratifying the contract in their own persons.

Into the question of Infant Baptism we do not intend to enter. Few persons have ever rejected it, and the number of objectors is, we believe, still diminishing. There is, however, a point of considerable interest connected with the subject, on which some observations may be offered: we allude to *sponsors* in the administration of that ordinance.

Because *sponsors* were received in the Church of Rome, some persons, after the Reformation, began to call the practice in question, asserting that it was a relic of popery. It is well known that all Dissenters, even those who practice Infant Baptism, reject *sponsors*. With them, indeed, baptism is a mere sign, and on their principles might be easily dispensed with. Such, doubtless, would be the case, were it not for the express command of our Lord, which connects it with believing. It may, therefore, be well to direct the attention of our readers to this subject; in order that it may be seen, that the Anglican Church in this, as in all her practices, is supported by the concurring voice of the Church in every age from the earliest period.

It appears that in early times there were three classes of *sponsors*: *first*, for infants; *secondly*, for the sick; *thirdly*, for adults in general. Originally, parents were admitted as *sponsors* for their own children. The precise period when the use of *sponsors* was adopted cannot be ascertained. They are alluded

to by Tertullian, who lived at the close of the *second*, and the commencement of the *third* century. It is evident, therefore, that the practice was general in his time; and if it were general at so early a period, the conclusion is evident: namely, that it was derived from the apostolic age, and ought to be observed by the Christian Church in all places and at all times. When Whitgift and Cartwright entered into those matters which were then at issue between the Church and the Puritans, the former, in allusion to *sponsors*, has the following pertinent remark:—

“It is also manifest by these authorities, that godfathers or sureties were required at the baptizing of infants: which Tertullian also signifieth in his Booke *de Baptismo*. But you yourselves confesse godfathers to be of great antiquitie in the Church of Christ; for you say that *Higinus* brought them in, and *Higinus* was the ninth Bishop of Rome, and lived *Anno 141*.”*

Cartwright, as is usual in the present day, objected that the sponsors promised more than they could perform; and to establish his position, he quoted St. Paul’s words, Rom. vii. ver. 15-21, in which the apostle speaks of man’s inability to save himself, ascribing his salvation to the mercy of God. Whitgift’s reply is so masterly, and so complete an answer to all the cavils of modern Dissenters on this head, that we feel no hesitation in quoting it. We feel sure, indeed, that our readers will be grateful for the quotation:—

“But what is this to the promise of godfathers made at the baptizing of infants? If you would have a man to promise nothing but that which is in his power to performe, then must you simplelie condemne all promises made by man, for theyre is nothing in his power to performe; no, not moving of his foot, not coming to dinner or supper. Therefore, as all other promises bee made with these secrete conditions, *if God will, so much as lyeth in me, to the uttermost of my power, if I live*, so is the promise in baptism made by the godfathers likewise.”†

In endeavouring to traduce the Book of Common Prayer, Cartwright adopted the method of those who wish to obtain the victory by whatever means—namely, that of seeking for objections to the book which really could not be applied to it with any reason. To bring the practice of *sponsors* into disrepute with the people, he glanced at the characters of those who were admitted to the office. Whitgift, in his reply, confines himself to those objections which are tangible, and which are alleged against any particular ceremonies. He thus answers his opponent’s cavil on the point in question, and the answer is an admirable one:—

“Touching the last, which you rhetorically say *you will speak nothing of*, that is, *the evil choyse of witnesses*, I thinke in part it is true;

* “Whitgift’s Defence,” Fol. 1574. p. 613.

† “Whitgift’s Defence,” 618.

but you speake that without the booke, and therefore without my compasse of defense ; for I mean not to take upon me the defense of any abuse within the booke (if there be any), much less without the booke."*

Undoubtedly improper persons are sometimes admitted as *sponsors*, and we are the last to defend the practice ; but surely the misconduct of individuals in assuming the office, or of others in permitting them to assume it, does not involve the unscripturalness, or the condemnation of the practice itself. As well might the use of wine be discarded, because persons abuse it ; or that of food, because there have been individuals who have shortened their days by gluttony. On such a principle, indeed, it would be difficult to defend not merely rites and ceremonies, but even the doctrines of our holy religion, since there is not one which has not been abused at one period or other by certain individuals.

In order to carry out the views of the Church on this important subject, it is indispensable that the baptismal service should be performed at the appointed time, namely, after the second lesson at morning or evening prayer, before the whole congregation. As the ordinance is celebrated in almost all our churches, it is reduced to mere private baptism. At all events, the intention of the Church is completely defeated, in not performing the service in the presence of all the people. The rubric is followed in some churches ; but why is it not followed in all ? As matters now stand, the congregation never consider themselves as at all concerned in the solemnization of this sacred ordinance, except in the case of their own children or the children of their friends ; whereas the whole assembled people ought to be witnesses of the reception into the Saviour's fold of those infants who are presented to the Lord in baptism. We cannot but hope that an improvement, in this respect, will soon become general. Some of our Bishops, and among others the Bishop of Exeter, have recommended a strict adherence to the rubric in this particular. This is well ; but we should wish to see our prelates proceeding a step further : we would have them not merely recommend, but command. So unaccustomed have the people been to the administration of baptism during the service, that there might be some objection to the return to the legitimate practice ; but we are persuaded that any clergyman would be able, by a simple explanation, to remove any such objections from the minds of reasonable persons : and with respect to the unreasonable, little uneasiness need be experienced. The common objection would be the additional length of the service ; but any

* "Whitgift's Defence," 613.

reflecting person would soon feel ashamed of assuming such a line of argument. In the most populous parishes the service need not be administered more frequently than every second Sunday; and as it would occur only once during the day, no one could complain of being detained twenty minutes at most longer on such an occasion. It would be easy too for the clergyman to meet the wishes of the objectors in part, by shortening his sermon on that particular day to the extent of ten minutes. However, the objection as to time is too absurd ever to be seriously advanced; and we are not aware of any other that can be raised.

Among what may be termed the *Antiquities* of the Christian Church, the *rite* of Confirmation also holds a prominent place. It gives us much pleasure to select these points, because they illustrate the principles on which our venerated Reformers acted. We have the testimony of the early fathers that confirmation was an apostolic rite; nor is it possible for the opponents of the ceremony to establish the contrary. It was not objected to until modern times; and even now most of the reformed churches retain the practice. The Puritans were willing to retain it, provided it were administered by the parochial clergy. Still they declaimed against its abuse in the Church of Rome, as our present Dissenters are accustomed to do. Whitgift's reply, on this point, to Cartwright, is so well and so forcibly put, that it will do exceedingly well for our modern objectors:—

“If that be a sufficient reason to abolishe it, bycause it hath bene horribly abused, then what shall you retheyne, either in the Church, or in the common lyfe of man? But I have before, in talking of apparell, declared the vanitie of this reason; and yet the confirmation that is now used was never abused by the Papistes, for they had it not, neyther any similitude of it, but only the name, whiche cannot contaminate the thyng.”*

The next subject, on which we would enter, relates to the use of a prescribed Form of Prayer.

Even the opponents of liturgies admit that their use was common in the fourth century. If then the practice was general at that time, it is incumbent on them to show when they were introduced; or the inference is, that liturgies had been used by the Church from the beginning. The opponents of liturgical forms cannot, however, make out their case; consequently, the evidence of all antiquity, even previous to the fourth century, is in our favour. In the fourth century, the mention of and allusion to

* “Whitgift's Defence,” 1725.

liturgies are frequent in the works of Christian authors. The Emperor Constantine prepared a form of prayer for the use of his soldiers; a step which he would not have taken, if in those days a liturgy had been deemed unlawful.

The members of the Anglican Church have the consolation of knowing that their liturgy, that precious legacy from our martyred Reformers, is founded on holy Scripture, and on the liturgies of the primitive Church. Great portions of our liturgy are couched in the language of sacred Scripture; and no words can be more acceptable to God in prayer than the words of the Holy Spirit. Many portions also are taken from the liturgies in use in the early Church. In framing our Book of Common Prayer the Reformers had a view to the ancient liturgies; knowing that those early forms had been sanctioned by some of the holiest and wisest men who ever lived, if not by some of the apostles themselves. It is certain that they had been prepared and approved by some of the fathers, *who had conversed with the apostles*, and had succeeded them as rulers in the Christian Church.

Let any devout and unprejudiced person, who has been accustomed to the worship of the Anglican Church, attend for a few times the worship of our English Dissenters. He will be at a loss to account for his own feelings, so unlike what they have ever been when engaged in the solemn services of God's sanctuary. He will find himself a mere spectator, or hearer of a sermon or lecture, but not at all connected with the worship itself, as is the case in the Anglican Church. One of the greatest possible privileges is secured by our Church to all who worship within her pale: we allude to the share which the people take in the public service. Certain portions of the liturgy are repeated by the minister, while others are recited by the people; and thus the worship is mutual between the congregation and the minister. The former feel that they are not excluded—that they are not mere hearers—that they do not come to church simply to listen to another, but to offer up their own prayers, in conjunction with the appointed minister, to the throne of God.

It was said by a wise heathen, "*Catonem non intellexit civitas nisi cum perdidit*;" and we say the same of the Anglican Church. Let her be destroyed, and then her excellence will be understood; for it would be found that the destruction of the Church would prove the severest blow to the existence of true religion. The command of St. Paul to the Corinthian Church, "*Let all things be done decently and in order*," implies that the Church at Corinth possessed a power to regulate such matters as rites and ceremonies; and that power has never been recalled.

There were other topics of equal interest, which we had in-

tended to bring before our readers: but we forbear. We trust, however, that this notice of Christian Antiquities may be the means of exciting in the breasts of some of our readers a desire to pursue the matter for themselves. Few subjects possess greater interest to the Christian student. If we feel pleasure in searching into the origin of nations, and in tracing their history through successive generations—if we are interested in the manners and customs of our forefathers, we ought surely to feel equal, nay greater, interest in studying the ancient things of the Church—in searching into its early history, in examining into its rites and ceremonies, and in tracing the connexion between the customs of our own Church and those of antiquity. We do not apprehend that, in general, the tendency of the present day is to defer too much to the ancients: on the contrary, we believe that the tendency is, whatever some persons may allege to the contrary, to the opposite extreme. We have, for instance, pamphlets in which it is attempted to prove that the primitive fathers are not safe guides. The very attempt to establish such a position, within the compass of a small pamphlet, is unreasonable; but it may be regarded as an indication of the feelings of many of the present generation.

We do not, by these remarks, wish to persuade our readers to take the fathers as their only guides; they were fallible men like ourselves; but we wish to pay that deference to their writings and opinions which is due to men who lived in the early ages of the Church, and who could not have been influenced in their profession by any worldly motives. The study of Christian Antiquities will lead to the due appreciation of the fathers: it will, on the one hand, prevent the student from valuing them at too high a rate; and on the other hand, it will prevent them from being ignorantly and unjustly depreciated. It will, in fact, lead to just conclusions respecting the views and practices of the ancient Church.

With these remarks we take our leave of a subject which ought to recommend itself to every intelligent Churchman. With regard to the learned author of the great work just published by Mr. Straker, we would observe that his views on all subjects were exceedingly moderate. His object appears to have been, to give a fair and impartial account of the rites, ceremonies, discipline and government of the ancient Church. That he has succeeded in his object, must be allowed by all who are competent to form an accurate estimate of his important labours. In these volumes, the reader may trace the origin of all those practices which are still retained in the Anglican Church; he may satisfy himself respecting any early custom; and above all, he will ob-

tain a view of the Christian Church, not as she was corrupted and deformed by popery in the dark ages, but as she appeared in her primitive glory, before superstition and ignorance had spread their sable mantle over her fair face, and when she had no arm of flesh to depend upon, being unsupported by earthly governments, but her only prop was the abiding and invigorating assurance, that "the Lord of Hosts was with her, that the God of Jacob was her refuge."

ART. VII.—*Projet d'Ordonnance portant Règlement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées.* Paris. 1840.

2. *Lettre d'un Laïque à un Pasteur sur le Projet d'Ordonnance portant règlement d'Administration pour les Eglises Réformées.* Risler. 1840.
3. *Lettre à un Pasteur sur le Projet d'Ordonnance, &c.* Par ATHANASE COQUEREL, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris. Cherbuliez. 1840.
4. *Lettre à M. Athanase Coquerel sur le Projet d'Ordonnance, &c.* Par le Cte. AGENOR DE GASPARIN, Maître des Requêtes au Conseil d'Etat. René et Cie.
5. *Lettre à M. le Cte. A. de Gasparin sur le Méthodisme.* Par JOSEPH MARTIN PASCHOD, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris. Cherbuliez.
6. *Le Salut dans toutes les Eglises.* Sermon par ATHANASE COQUEREL. Cherbuliez.

IT is with great anxiety that we look abroad throughout Europe at the present time, when Romanism is making such desperate efforts to spread and make sure her footing; when error, and infidelity, and pride, and selfishness, and luxury, and rebellion, and every evil impulse, are arising with unusual energy, and seem to be directed by the spirit of evil to destroy the simplicity and sincerity of faith—it may not be wholly unimportant, to see what auxiliaries can be found in other countries for upholding those principles of true religion, which it appears to be, especially, England's privilege to be called upon to maintain.

France, from the important station which she occupies in the midst of Europe, seems naturally to claim our attention next after this country. In pondering upon God's ways, we would be led to desire for her, that if Great Britain be called to be the depository and keeper, as it were, of God's truth, France might one day appear as the working power for putting that truth into action among the nations of Europe. Whoever, with an obser-

vant eye, has traversed the continent must have remarked a gradual but general fusion of habits and manners—a universal progress in the great work of assimilation, which *must* go on increasing with the facilities for international intercourse. Taking, then, our point of departure from this our own highly-favoured land—a land, stationed on the limits of Europe, with a mission during the past centuries, first to influence society politically, through her admirable constitution, and then commercially, by that spirit of trade which, though slumbering in the rest of Europe, was preserved here for her prosperity; and now we trust spiritually, by the purity of her Apostolic Church, taking, therefore, this point of departure, we look across the channel to see what religious elements we can find in the *Protestantism of France*.

The written controversy which has been carrying on for some time between the promoters of Separatism and the Established *Eglise Réformée*, has induced us to take up a series of pamphlets, whose titles are placed at the head of this article, as being well calculated to give some idea of the state of religion in France; a subject on which it is extremely difficult for persons in this country to obtain either accurate or sufficient information. Those who are acquainted only with the Protestantism of England—where our privileged Church, at the same time she protested against the errors and abuses which overspread Europe, remained, nevertheless, *Catholic*, shaking off only the yoke of Rome with her abominations—can have very little idea of what the present Protestantism of France really is. We purpose, therefore, first, to give a brief sketch of the mode of Ecclesiastical Government in the *Eglise Réformée*, and afterwards to shew the circumstances which led to its present distracted state.

Painful, indeed, is the view which these pamphlets present: we seek for a *Church*, and we find only unconnected heterogeneous fragments; we seek for some power of godliness capable of making head against the errors of the Romish communion, and we find, on one side, the exclusive doctrines of ultra-Calvinism, on the other the laxity of modern Neologism, even to the rejecting the doctrine of the atonement; we seek for, at least, an outward unity, but, alas! we meet with a political separatism, similar, in spirit and operation, to modern Dissent in England, using all its efforts to batter down what establishment does exist, in order to substitute, in its place, pure Independency, with the voluntary principle. In short, these pamphlets disclose to us the melancholy picture of a Protestant body, tending to the same spirit and position as when France was ravaged by a

religious civil war; when the Reformed faith being engaged in a struggle for its very existence in that country, all the aid which neighbouring powers friendly to its cause could give the Reformed, might, indeed, add to their importance, as a *political body*, but never could impart the preponderancy of a *Church*.

Before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, by which event the Huguenot Church may be considered as having ceased to exist, it was, in its constitution, purely Presbyterian; it had its national and provincial synods, and all the subordinate machinery of the Presbyterian system. Buonaparte found the body, after the revolution, shattered and dissolved. He restored, in part, the framework of Presbyterianism; and the present constitution of the Protestant body in France, known usually by the name of "*Eglise Réformée*," is denominated, in the "*Lettre à un Pasteur*," (p. 23) *Presbyterian Independency*: wherein the Churches, "whether or not grouped together and subjected to synods, are all of them not only on an equality, but also independent."

It was organized thus in 1802, when Buonaparte restored the "Cultes," by the law called, "La Loi du 18 Germinal an X." No national synod was then established, but local ones *were* appointed, which however *have never met*, so that each *Eglise Consistoriale* is, in the true sense of the word, "Independent," being bound by no connexion, except with the central administration in Paris, committed to the *Ministre des Cultes*. The authority rests with the Consistory, or body of Lay Elders, and finally with the crown, in the person of the *Ministre des Cultes*, who has of late always been one of the cabinet ministers, usually the *Garde des Sceaux*.

The Consistory is formed of the members of the Protestant body in each locality who pay the highest amount of taxes; which plan was probably considered the best means of securing respectability and order, at the time when the materials of Protestantism were first raised out of the ruin of the French Revolution.

The original establishment of the Consistories was evidently made with a view to the exercise of hierarchical functions. The law appointed a Consistory for every six thousand souls; but there are now Consistories for a much less number. Each Consistorial Church was not to extend beyond its own Department; yet every where they have now gone beyond that limit. But it is evident that the fulness of the episcopal jurisdiction was meant to be represented by the local synods, composed of five Consistorial Churches, which the law enacted shall meet

under the sanction of the government. Those synods have, however, never assembled, and the local ecclesiastical authority has fallen into the hands of the Consistories.

The question must immediately present itself to the mind, how the Consistory, so composed, can be qualified to superintend the pastoral functions, or pay due regard to the sacred matters committed to the sacerdotal charge. The consequence, less to be wondered at than deplored, has indeed been a complete disjoining of the whole fabric. No superintendence being exercised, no discipline maintained, all the Consistorial Churches, universally and without exception, have broken up into sections; each separate congregation has created a Consistory of its own, presided over by the pasteur of the place; the members have taken the name of Deacons or Elders, which assumption being unrecognised and illegal, the letters which they write to the Prefect or to the Ministre remain unanswered, and they themselves falling into rivalry with the chief Consistory, no authority exists to adjust their differences. (*Lettre No. 3, p. 12.*)

As there has been no new legislation since the law of 18 Germinal, this confusion has gone on increasing; some of the Consistories arbitrarily exceeding the limits of their authority, others negligently falling short of their duties. It has happened that Consistories have remained three years without assembling. The pasteur (the senior one if there are several) who presides over these meetings has indeed the sounding name of "President du Consistoire;" but often without possessing any corresponding influence—too frequently without due freedom of action or of speech. The power of obtaining the dismissal of a pasteur resides with the Consistory; but the law upon this point appears to be in a very unsettled state, as it likewise is with regard to the responsibility of the pasteur in summoning the Consistory, that of the secretary for the records, and of the treasurer for the accounts.

To apply some remedy to this anarchy was the object of the projet d'ordonnance (No. 1.) It proposes the circumscription of Consistorial Churches; regulates the licensing and erection of new places of divine worship; settles the condition of the pasteurs, and other matters remaining hitherto in uncertainty.

These intentions are met by a violent opposition from a party whose organ is the author of *Lettre, No. 2*; and which openly manifests an unwillingness that the present state of things should be interfered with; says not a word of the existing anarchy; denies the government such a right to regulate for them; and indeed accuses it of invading their liberty, and

wishing to annul it entirely—"L'intention de la restreindre de l'annuler, de la demolir pièce à pièce." This, although nothing of the kind is hinted at in the pamphlet, emanates from the Société Evangélique.

But the author of *Lettre No. 2*, removes the veil, and taxes the Société Evangélique with fostering this misrule, and encouraging all this weakness and irregularity; the author speaks out, and declares that the "cri d'alarme" has proceeded from the "Méthodistes," "Separatistes;" by which terms we are to understand those persons who have dissented even from the established Presbyterian Independency, and who hold peculiar and exclusive doctrines. He accuses them openly of wishing to disorganize the Eglise Réformée, and thereby to get it into their power.

We read in the preface to the Sermon (No. 6), a somewhat curious exposé of what occurred at the Conférences Pastorales in May last, when le Méthodisme (i. e. the Dissenters), it seems, threw off the mask, "a dit son dernier mot." This is the résumé of the declarations then made by the leaders of that party:—

"1. Nos doctrines sont essentiellement exclusives parceque seules elles conduisent au salut ;

"2. Il y a blâsphème à contredire ces doctrines ;

"3. Le but des efforts des pasteurs Méthodistes, et particulièrement de ceux qui se rattachent à la Société Evangélique, est d'expulser des Eglises Reformées les pasteurs qui n'ont pas leurs opinions :

"4. Nous agirons avec les Consistoires, sans les Consistoires, ou malgré les Consistoires."

The banner is therefore unfurled against the constituted Church: it is set at defiance. The Separatists claim the right of meeting wherever they like, in places licensed or unlicensed. They maintain the right of irregular ministrations, and of adopting whatsoever measures they please, without regard to the constituted frame-work of the Eglise Réformée.

The Société which at the present time takes up this ground and language against the Eglise Réformée Nationale first took its rise in about the year 1832. Its originators, Independents of England and America, united with *Swiss* Separatists and a French pasteur, who, through dislike to establishments, left the Eglise Réformée to concur in erecting the standard of the voluntary principle, and over the door of their place of meeting they inscribed, "Culte Protestant non salarié par l'Etat." At their first setting out they wished to absorb and comprehend all other evangelical labours in France; and such as were able or willing to merge their individuality, remained connected with it. It was worked with these materials; and in 1835-6, by uniting itself with the

Geneva Société, which had a corresponding committee in London, the Paris society obtained a footing in this country. The two names remained conjoined, "Les Sociétés Evangéliques de Genève et de Paris;" but more lately we read "de Paris et de Genève," as if the Geneva society had somewhat fared like a weaker prince who calls in a powerful auxiliary. The Paris society introduced itself into England by means of the friends of Protestantism in Switzerland, especially those belonging to our Established Church. These latter might not otherwise have been found willing to engage in promoting Dissent in France.

This unity of action, this energy in operating, the high tone assumed in doctrine, have obtained for the society an influence opposed to the Eglise Réformée; and this influence has gradually been extended by connexion with several of the pasteurs.

They *pretend* never formally to have separated from the Eglise Réformée, and would still claim to belong to her; being perhaps, in that respect, somewhat similar to the Wesleyan Methodists in this country. They would still have it believed that they are in connexion with the Eglise Réformée, and appear indeed as if they would soon lay exclusive claim to that denomination; but the "Lettre à un Pasteur" convicts them of having made a real separation, in having constituted themselves into what they would call a Church by having the communion among them: it accuses them of using the licenses of Dissent and pretending still to be of the Eglise Réformée. There is evidently no dislike, on their part, to be styled Eglise Dissidente, and raised into the importance of a Church. Though *out* of the Church, they would have no objection to have "ponts volants," fly-bridges, to go backwards and forwards at pleasure.

The Eglise Réformée, viewing them in the light of rivals rather than auxiliaries, says, "we allow you the greatest liberty, and are willing to allow you every latitude you may want, and that the law allows you; do not interfere with us; let us legislate for ourselves; we don't interfere with you."

The author of *Lettre No. 4*, M. Gasparin, has eulogised the Dissenters, on the ground of their *enlightened* faith, which has quickened their zeal. He recalls the "Doctrines livrées au Rationalisme," which makes the Romanists at this day say of the Eglise Réformée, "Le Protestantisme n'est pas une religion; c'est une philosophie morale assez sage; mais il n'y a rien là d'obligatoire; rien qu'on ne puisse accepter, ou rejeter à son gré;" and wishes to show what the Dissenters have done towards quickening the mighty mass. But the Letter in reply refuses to allow the statements of deadness before these dissenting labours

commenced; repels the pretention of the Separatists, who lay claim, he says, to a great deal more than belongs to them :—

“Quant aux ‘Méthodistes’ ce n’est pas à moi de juger leurs œuvres ; je n’aime pas à voir faire ni à faire ces jugemens ; ils n’appartiennent qu’à Celui devant qui tout est découvert, qui sonde les cœurs et les reins, et qui souvent peut-être, ce que nous appelons *bien* l’appelle *mal*, et ce que nous appelons *mal* l’appelle *bien*.” (p. 15.)

“Cependant, je puis reconnoître, qu’ils ont manifesté et qu’ils manifestent du zèle ; ils ont bâti et ils bâtissent encore des chapelles et des temples dans quelques endroits où il en manquait, et surtout dans ceux où il s’en trouvait déjà ; ils ont appelé et ils appellent des pasteurs dans quelques Eglises qui n’en avaient pas, et dans beaucoup d’autres qui en avaient ; ils ont fondé et ils entretiennent une seconde société pour la dissemination des Ecritures ; ils ont colporté, et ils colportent dans tous les villages ces petits écrits de controverse sur la *religion d’argent* qui effraient le catholicisme : enfin ils ont fait, comme vous le dits, et font encore chaque jour ‘relever la tête au prosélytisme, ce fils légitime de la foi ;’ dont il n’entre pas dans mon dessein de parler ici, et sur lequel il me seroit difficile de partager toutes vos vues. Je reconnais, dis-je, volontiers toutes ces choses, qu’encore une fois il ne m’appartient pas de juger.”

This last remark on proselytism may, in this country, appear somewhat strange ; it can only be understood by considering that in France the two communions, both Protestant and Romanist, are paid alike by the State ; whence the position arises, that setting forth the truth, seizing all opportunities of making the light to shine and fruits of faith to appear, without a spirit of controversy and proselytism, is the safest, and finally will be found the best, course for advancing the cause of God’s truth.

This, then, is the aspect which Protestantism presents—disunion in doctrine, anarchy in discipline ; a small but restless body setting itself in antagonism with the established institutions, and upon every effort of the Government to establish a degree of order, holding such language as “pourquoi le gouvernement voulait il se mêler de notre regime interieur ? (Lettre No. 3, p. 4) ; and speaks of “Une conception scandaleusement illégale.” (p. 28.)

Can it be wondered at, then, if the Government find it a difficult task to legislate for such a body ; that it should let collective interests of that body remain in sufferance, in comparison of those of the Church of Rome ? In detail, however, every encouragement is afforded to Protestantism ; the Government allows money for building their temples and increases the number of their pasteurs. In 1828, there were 520 pasteurs ; in 1841, there are to be 660 ; the amount in the budget for main-

taining the Protestant worship has increased nearly one-half in the same space of time.

The Separatist connexion which is now showing itself in France too much resembles in its principles the dissenting mass in this country. They seem unable to exist without agitation and aggression. The author of the *Lettre à un Pasteur* has recalled to them the obligations they are under to the state, and which they seem so soon to have forgotten. When Buonaparte raised them they were nothing, they had nothing : that even the "*Religion prétendue réformée*" was no more. "De 1685, révocation de l'édit de Nantes, à 1802, promulgation des lois organiques des Cultes, notre Culte n'étoit plus, en France, même la religion prétendue réformée ; il n'étoit plus une religion, quelques pasteurs du desert, vénérables débris épargnés par les orages, quelques chapelains des ambassades Protestantes, c'étoit tout notre corps ecclésiastique." (*Lettre à Pasteur*, No. 3, p. 16.)

The Pasteur de l'Eglise Réformée, recals how difficult it was to legislate with materials almost unknown ; and the thankfulness he would wish to excite, contrasts strongly with the surly silence of the Separatist's organ ; nay, they are not afraid to declare that they are under no obligation to the civil power ; that if left to themselves they would have done much better. M. de Gasparin, who holds some office in the Conseil d'Etat, should have informed us what they could do *now* without the State ? Could they support the pasteurs in the same manner as they are now established over different parts of the country ? Could they support their faculties of theology ? And would they support the *Aumôniers* they have at the colleges of Sorreze and Henry IV. for the Protestant youth who study there ? Without the support and intervention of the State, do they flatter themselves they could maintain their position of respect and independence in presence of the Roman Catholic body ? Or would they think themselves justified in having recourse to arms, as was wont to be the case in the time of the religious wars ?

But the apologist of the Separatists, says not a word upon the connexion of Church and State ; he speaks, indeed, of confiding infant congregations to Wesleyans, Baptists, &c., but what strange union is to arise from this ? What guarantee can this be considered as likely to afford to the Government of permanent order ?

But M. de Gasparin believes the Protestant body can be brought back to unity, and be kept in it, by the sole use and power of the Bible, without a *confession de Foi*, of which we have

some intimation here given, is being revived from the old confession de la Rochelle : this confession is, however, rejected on the one hand by the maintainers of the Eglise Réformée, because it would be establishing an exclusive spirit resulting from the ultra doctrines of predestination and reprobation ; while it is set aside by others, the partizans of the Société Evangélique as unnecessary and indeed prejudicial ; so that there seems no probable end of the debate, nor any likelihood of our seeing any authority competent to bring about a union. Where the authority of the Bible is invoked, it is not intimated that any are to be the recognized judges and keepers of the true meaning of the Bible. There is nothing here, we fear, that can heal the disease. The unhappy examples of Switzerland and of America, those overflowing fountains of error and vain wild imaginings have not yet been sufficient to teach what are the consequences of the individual and undisciplined interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

“Uniformity, (says the late lamented Christian advocate of Cambridge, Thomas Rennell) is no less essential to the general reception of Christianity, than the peace of those who receive it. With a view, therefore, both of regulating and confirming the faith of many, and of reconciling the divisions of the few, articles of belief were first introduced into the Christian Church, and public professions of faith framed and established. In the earliest ages, even in the Apostolic Church, the recitation of a creed accompanied the initiation by baptism into the congregation of Christians. Thus is the witness of man added to the witness of God.

“It is added not to strengthen its power, or to ratify its validity, as the witness of God is infinitely greater than the witness of man. It is added that the witness of God might be thus comprehended by the faculties of man ; that the powers of the Creator might be adapted to the weakness of the creature. The witness which God hath vouchsafed of himself in the revelation of his will to man is a burning and a shining light ; but it is a light only to those who will place themselves under the guidance of its beams. To assist the ignorant by an uniform rule of belief ; to relieve the occupied by an abstract of their religion ; to fix the wavering by articles of faith—is the office, the duty, and the testimony of man to his fellow-creatures. This is the witness of men, and upon this witness we assent to the articles of our faith and recite our creed. We join in one common confession and worship ; we are united in the bond of charity, peace, and union, under the name, the guidance, and the authority, of one common, visible, and established Church.”—(*Sermons*, Ed. 1825, p. 20.)

M. de Gasparin pleads that the Separatists have a right to obtain favour, because in their meetings they pray for the king and the royal family ; but it is evident, that with no other con-

nexion with the Government, that which they grant to day may be withdrawn to morrow, should they think they have sufficient ground for withholding it.

The Disidents may succeed in dividing the Protestant body; they may quicken zeal and promote piety within the limited sphere of their operations, but they can have no well-founded hope of ever substituting their system of Independency in the place of the Romish Church over the whole face of France. They have now had the *champ libre* for twenty-five years, and where is the company of new reformed who have entered the temples during that quarter of a century, notwithstanding the prevailing—almost universal—rejection, in many parts, of the Romish system. Have they been able to keep even such places as have made a decided manifestation of separation and scission from the Church of Rome? Have their institutions been sufficient to keep them in connexion, and to rescue them finally out of the hands of popery, from which they sought to escape?

We find no justification offered for Separatism; M. de Gasparin openly reprehends it, and laments, as we must join with him in deploring, that any should have come out; where, indeed, was the necessity, since there are faithful men who can remain in? Or is it not that Independency, which is republicanism in religion, can also find its partizans? What else has obliged the author of "*Lettre*" No. 3 to insert these words:—

"Je doute beaucoup qu'il y ait dans ces refus (meaning the opposition of the Separatists) seulement un excès de prudence ou l'amour de la liberté, et je déclare que, pour quelques siècles encore, je ne vois pas plus raison d'être républicain en piété que de l'être en politique."—(*Lettre*, No. 3. p. 28.)

And *such* persons may, we know, assert with effrontery that no other system will do for France. The whole history of Protestantism in France abundantly shows that the system of Independency cannot maintain itself there; it has not been able, nor is it now able, to stand against Romanism; there is nothing but an *Episcopal Church*, with her scriptural doctrines and regular succession, which can make head against popery.

And is it meant that we should profit nothing in the present age by past experience? The spirit which Independency is resuscitating in France now, and which alone it can excite, is similar to that which prevailed in those unfortunate times to which we have adverted: its character is too secular and political—not sufficiently ecclesiastical; and the latter is what is sought for by mankind with regard to spiritual things. It will be sufficient to cast a general glance at the progress and mode of existence of the Huguenot body, to establish the truth of both these assertions.

It was unfortunately constituted: they always sought a chief—a political head—while all their pastors were on an equality. Besides their national synod, and their particular synods, they had their *political* assemblies, national and provincial, which always met, whereby they seemed to separate their interests from the common interest around them, and showed themselves as an empire within an empire.

In consequence of this we find them, even while in the full enjoyment of their privileges under the edict of Nantes, ready to join in conspiracies and confederacies, whereby they imagined they might derive an increase of advantage and security. Witness that treaty with the Prince of Condé, preparing to appear in arms in 1615 or 1616. Hence they were enabled, through a political assembly in 1620, to offer to place Lesdiguières at the head of 20,000 men, and to guarantee for their maintenance a monthly subsidy of 100,000 crowns.

Ever prompt to have recourse to arms, they organized themselves militarily. At the *levée de boucliers*, which neither the pacific counsels of Duplessis, nor the refusal of the Duc de Bouillon and of Lesdiguières to command their armies, could deter them from engaging in; they made a new military division of the kingdom, distributing the provinces into eight circles, each placed under a separate general of their own; the assembly reserving for itself a paramount authority; and to its ordinances and commissions was appended a seal emblematic of independence. Too like the parliament of England, they set at defiance the royal authority, met the belligerent inclination of the court with an equally martial disposition; they declined accommodation, and all this was done in the character of a religious body! Such an imperium in imperio must necessarily give umbrage. At another time, in order to support themselves as a political party, they did not fear to seek the alliance of the King of Spain. Such a system could not conciliate authority, in whatsoever hands it might be placed—one or the other necessarily must yield. We very much question whether it could ever have maintained itself in Scotland, if the seat of government had not been transferred to this side the Tweed. Nor could it have been prevalent in Switzerland without the aid of republicanism and the circumstances of a very circumscribed territory.

How often, in their unhappy history, do the representations of their assembled ministers appear unavailing—they seem as a body to have had *no weight*. The Reformed have been able to *remonstrate* only with arms in their hands. In the absence of ecclesiastics invested with dignity, they had recourse to their Protector; they called in laymen to treat for them, and were re-

presented by *seigneurs* who, not unnaturally, made the *spiritual* interests of the Huguenot body yield to their *secular* interests and temporal projects. Between the year 1559 and 1660 there assembled twenty-nine national synods, consequently there was abundant scope for their system. What did it produce? To what state had they brought either the mind of the country or their own particular feeling? * The objects with which they occupied themselves when they assembled in national synod were really so futile, so unlike the great church interests of a nation, that we can quite understand the impotency of their ecclesiastical censure and discipline in general—the sad consequences that ensued when that discipline was actually put into execution. We have said that the body was not sufficiently ecclesiastical. It never took the proper *church* stand: they never had confidence in their *right* to prevail; they felt the absence of regular ecclesiastical authority, and always stood prepared themselves for a struggle. Even Duplessis, at the period when their hopes might be considered strongest and their pretensions at the highest, he limits his stipulations to this: “that the Huguenot service may be celebrated, if not in the interior of towns, at least in their *faubourgs*”—what an idea of nationality in church matters does this convey! Even Henry IV., in declarations prior to the edict of Nantes, spoke of them as “*en dehors*.”

What was wanted when Beza held his controversy with the Cardinal de Lorraine at St. Germain, manifesting, indeed, the power of godliness with the gifts and graces of a believer? There was wanting a church body, to the standing and importance of which the advantages he gained could be available. Is it too much to say, that if the Reformed body, instead of relying upon political chieftains and secular leaders, had had an imposing body of clergy, invested with authority, power, and dignity, to represent them in their *religious* interests—that their franchises would have been less encroached upon, their treaties less disregarded? Had there been a clerum imposing from its order, venerated for its spiritual descent and inspiring awe from the respect rendered to its sacerdotal character, the detestable massacre of St. Bartholomew might have been divested of much of its atrocities. It might not have been so *easily planned*, nor perpetrated in the way in which the sanguinary tools of fanaticism thought they might sacrifice laymen without a church, and ministers in whom they did not recognize the priestly office.

* For some very striking details on the state of the Huguenots at the beginning of the 17th century, see Rev. E. Smedley's “History of the Reformed Churches in France,” vol. iii. chap. 22.

Had the Church at that time been episcopal, is there not room to presume that the destiny of the Huguenot body would have been very different?

We cannot without anguish of heart contemplate the venerable Duplessis Mornay abandoned in his old age, when he engaged in the controversy with the Cardinal Duperron. The part which Henry IV. took in humiliating one who had been so faithful a servant and friend was in the last degree disgraceful to him, as a man and as a prince. But in what terms does he speak of the transaction? Writing to the Duc d'Épernon, the morning after the conference, Henri says, "In truth, it was one of the greatest blows which has been, for a long time, struck in behalf of the Church of God." It is clear that the prevailing idea in the King's mind was, to consider the Romish communion as *the Church*, and the Huguenot body as *no Church*.

Henry had then renounced the Reformed creed for Romanism—an act upon which, more perhaps than upon any other, has turned, humanly speaking, the destinies of France. A right estimation of the motives upon which that act was founded, as far as human judgment can investigate, would lead to take into account the prevailing bias of his character, and to allow something for the lure of enjoying an undisputed throne; but we should also have to regard the experience which the King had of the working of the Huguenot system—the intimate acquaintance he had acquired with the nature of that body: his sense of what was necessary for administering the religious interests of a kingdom so large as France—these considerations called on him to judge, not as an individual only, nor as King of Navarre only, but as *King of France and Navarre*. The constant fluctuation attendant upon a religious body unsanctioned by apostolic succession, unconnected with the primitive Christian Church, unprotected by an hierarchy, must evidently have led that prince to ponder which system was better suited to the well-being of his whole empire—the Calvinistic or the Romanist, and to consider, in the words of Sully, that the latter was "the more certain of the two."

It cannot be denied that Henry had been, up to that time (notwithstanding some circumstances at the St. Bartholomew massacre), a staunch and sincere supporter of his party—he had often jeopardised his life for it: he might, indeed, know that the men who composed it sought another protector, when, on succeeding to the crown, Henry received (too graciously for the Huguenots) a deputation of Romanists. He might be aware that they wished to reject him, and to dissolve the con-

nexion; nor could the change be owing to any renewed besetment of the Romish priesthood, for he had shown himself proof against that. But now, as sovereign, the matter came more closely home to him, and in conforming to the Romish Church, it was not because it was *Romaine*, but because it was *Catholique*.

Had Henry found an ecclesiastical body capable of maintaining its right, both on the ground of doctrine and of discipline, to the title of Catholic and Apostolic Church—had he found a Reformed *Episcopal* institution in France, by means of which he could have consolidated *real* reforms, and in which he might have entertained a reasonable hope that the two conflicting parties among his subjects might one day merge; in which he might personally have taken refuge, and have been spared what he must unquestionably have felt as an act of humiliation—his abjuration; then, however small that body might have been at first, it cannot be deemed presumptuous to say that this disastrous event would *never have taken place*. But with the materials he had around him, this, melancholy though it be and deeply to be lamented, was the only result to which he was likely to come. The magnitude of the Huguenot party only manifested the more forcibly its want of union, cohesiveness, and durability. After all that precedes in the history of the Huguenots, it seems to surprise us less, though it does not make us deplore it the less bitterly.

With the abjuration of Henry IV. doubtless ended the prospect of Calvin's system obtaining as the universal religion in France. The Huguenots were, by a series of iniquitous usurpations, cruelly oppressed; left without money, without leaders, and without political influence. They had no ecclesiastical officers carrying a sufficient weight and dignity to sustain their cause, none to protect their rights, or to preserve this unfortunate people from gradual obliteration. Thus Romanism went on working out its ruinous consequences, until the tremendous convulsion of the great Revolution. Afterwards, when Buonaparte collected together the scattered elements of order and society, he re-established the Roman Catholic religion, and with it *Protestantism*; the former curtailed of its prerogatives, the latter increased and strengthened in its influence. We learn, by a passage in Las Cases' Memoirs, his predilection for establishing Protestantism as the universal religion in France; but we feel that what *then* was wanting to that end, is what Protestantism had been deficient in *before*, namely, the sanction of spiritual descent, the authority and succession of the primitive Church: and this is what is *still* wanting to give it the position it ought to occupy, and to confer upon it to any unity of faith or of action.

The founders of the system under consideration maintained the right of "independent setting apart," without any transmitting of the apostolic authority, and (notwithstanding one or two sentences of regret, doubtless very sincere, on the part of Calvin, at the loss of Episcopacy,) it does not appear that they ever *sought* to obtain that proper commission. They were satisfied with their own authority; they cut themselves off and separated themselves from the fellowship of that body which, by the right of orders, and through the episcopal institution, essentially composed and continued the visible universal Church. They saw the result, and had to endure the consequences. Nor would it be wondered at, if there were some *pasteurs* to be found, who may be convinced in their hearts that it is by apostolic order alone that their Churches can be rescued from their present lamentable state?

In the mean while the Separatists, it appears, are signing and adopting the Confession de Foi de la Rochelle, which the Nationalists repudiate as being in its feeling bitter and hostile, in its doctrine exclusive and ultra-Calvinistic, even to reprobation, therefore in no way adapted to the present state of mind and of society in France.

And lamentably does this discussion evidence the absence of some recognised standard of belief. The discussion which began upon points of administration, has gradually shifted its ground to points of doctrine, disclosing to us the most distressing divisions of opinion in the Protestant body. In this chaos of sentiment, where the language of piety is constantly, as it were, *traditionally* used—while, often, it is but too evident that true faith or true charity are deficient, it is truly painful to be obliged to notice, that those who would advocate the interests of order and discipline should at the same time come so deplorably short in the orthodox doctrines of the universal Church. That, while maintaining the right of private judgment and of individual interpretation in as unlimited and crude a manner as can be conceived, they should afford such a deplorable example of its results.* May not the truth be that they have been driven into these errors by contemplating those exclusive doctrines established at the time of the Reformation, to the neglect of those held by the primitive Church?

It is certainly not a little remarkable, however, that we should

* Another feature displayed in this controversy—is, that courtesy, real liberality, and gentlemanlike feeling are found with those who are the supporters of an Established Church; while narrowness, bitterness, denunciation and *morgue*, are on the side of the Separatists, who would style themselves liberals *par excellence*.

here find a passage making a distinction between doctrines whose origin dates only from the sixteenth century, and doctrines which are primitive :—

“ Cessez donc de nous engager à changer notre foi—celle qui depuis 18 siècles a été la lumière, le sel, la vie, et le salut, du monde.—contre les erreurs que nos pères il y a 300 ans ont bien pu professer comme leurs pères à eux, en avaient professé d’autres, mais que nous ne devons pas plus recevoir en héritage, qu’ils n’ont voulu eux mêmes recevoir les erreurs des âges précédents.”—(*Lettre No. 5, p. 32.*)

This assuredly is a very striking remark to be found in this discussion ; it is most important, however, that no mistake should be made about those more ancient doctrines : they are not to be regarded as the result of present individual judgment solely, but are to be sought after as the belief of the universal Church. The unreserved admission of belief in the Trinity, in the god-head of the Son, as well as equality of the three Persons ; the efficacy of the atonement, original sin, and the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit : doctrines which shall, indeed, abide when the phases of Luther’s and Calvin’s opinions shall have passed away ; and which shall be a means of blessing to every Church which fearlessly upholds them as such—as Catholic doctrines in opposition to error and innovation of whatsoever kind.

The Sermon, No. 6, is an able and truly eloquent appeal against the contracted doctrines of reprobation. It doubtless would have more weight, if it did not display so much reserve. However, where this backwardness is found in opposition to such extreme doctrines, it must be hoped that belief, though latent, may yet be entire. It repudiates the narrow contracted sphere in which the Genevan Church would confine her charities, as being insufficient to correspond to the expansive sympathies of true Christianity. If such men see that the system devised at the time of the Reformation has indeed disfigured the great edifice of the Christian Church, and broken it up into huts and solitary tenements, still Christian antiquity remains to all, both as to doctrine and as to discipline. Happily we can therein take refuge against the innovations and proud assumptions of modern reason, no less than the blind errors of remoter ignorance. Happily that stronghold remains to shield us from arrogant aggression. A striking character in the framers of new systems is, that they speak and would act as if nothing had ever been written, or said, or done before themselves. And thus it is with those who take their point of departure from the “Institutions” of Calvin.

And is this return to the confession of la Rochelle all that

the Separatists have to propose for that "Belle France" which lies at the feet of all enlightened believers, entreating to be raised up, and guided, and instructed? Is this all they have to offer? The doctrine of reprobation and the voluntary system—Exclusiveness and Independency? Must we think that they imagine this will suffice for that great nation? A great social body wants another kind of institution; it will have something that is susceptible of a truly *national* character; that is connected with the *primitive* introduction of Christianity into its bosom; in short, that is secured by the principles of hierarchy and apostolic succession. It is the same country, the same nation still—the continuation of the same Christian family. What though its faith may have become obscured, and its spiritual freedom ensnared by foreign artifice; yet it will not abdicate its character of nationality. Having once belonged to the universal Church, it will not be satisfied unless it be a part of it. This is what France has been determined to keep, even at the price of connexion with Rome. The day may come when that connexion shall be dispensed with in a scripturally orthodox yet national Catholicity! In the mean time, it does not appear likely that France will consent to be fractioned into as many Churches as there are towns, villages, hamlets, or even families and isolated châteaux. In one word, Independency has no possible prospect of success with the enlarged national and social feeling which subsists among the French.

It is not easy, however, to discover, whether the aversion which the national party manifest is most directed against the exclusive doctrine, or the uncharitable spirit of the Separatists. What we wish them to avoid is the old, restless, bitter, political party-spirit, which so long characterized the Huguenot body what we wish them to do is to infuse a proper and sufficient element of order into ecclesiastical affairs.

In the state to which matters have been now brought, it is easy to see that the Protestant body is in danger of falling into the gulf of democratic Independency on the one hand, or of Rationalism on the other. The Reformed portion of the community in France will, unless something be done to prevent it, very soon be less a source of strength than an element of discord in the country; so difficult is it for Independency to coincide with monarchy. Successive administrations have been very lenient towards the Separatists, letting them keep for years over the doors of their chapels, "*Culte Protestant non salarié par l'Etat.*" When, however, the application of the law has been called for by any illegal acts of theirs, although no real rigour was ever manifested, a great outcry was raised that the charter

was violated—that the constitution of the country was in danger ; and the question gravely mooted, under what circumstances it is lawful for Christian men to take up arms against civil authority—a policy which they doubtless considered necessary to secure the footing they *had* obtained, and to gain more room for their levelling principle. The Government is evidently disinclined from the exercise of severity (Lettre No. 3, p. 27). It remains to be seen, whether the measures of promptness and energy necessary to repel the aggression, and to ensure the supremacy of law and of order, will proceed from the judicature or the administrative, the courts of law or the Ministère des Cultes.

It is impossible, as members of an establishment, not to feel an interest in even a semblance of establishments. We have heard, of late, of fifty missionaries to be sent into France ; doubtless Colporteurs, workmen taken out of the Ateliers of Geneva, and entering France with republican views and levelling principles. But if, indeed, fifty men, duly qualified by piety and attainments, and with regular ordination, and having a stake and a position in the country, were to stand forth, supporting the interests of God's truth, as a branch of the true Reformed Church Catholic, the result might be other and far more rejoicing. It would seem that persons in England do not always know what they are assisting when they send their help over to France. Some think it is an Episcopal Church like our own—some that it is the established Protestantism of the country : but the Lettre No. 3 informs us, that people are beginning to learn it is Dissent they are encouraging, in supporting the Sociétés Évangéliques :—

“ Le Séparatisme, jusqu'ici hardiment mis en pratique, commence à déplaire de l'autre côté du détroit, au point que l'Angleterre menace de refuser ou de diminuer ses subsides. Dans un grand nombre de feuilles Anglaises, les Methodistes de Paris et de Genève ont été hautement accusés de favoriser le séparatisme, le système de plein divorce de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, et les consécérations illégales de pasteurs ou ministres. Il a fallu se défendre et rebrousser chemin. J'ai sous les yeux deux numeros d'un journal Anglais qui contiennent sur ce sujet les révélations les plus étranges, et qui montrent combien peu les Anglais savent ce qu'on fait de leur argent quand il a passé la mer, l'esprit de séparatisme qui règne dans les *Archives du Christianisme* est signalé dans ces feuilles de la manière la plus vive, et rien n'est plus curieux qu'une lettre de l'agent du Comité central de Londres des *Société Évangéliques de France et de Genève* (*Central Committee in London of the Sociétés Évangéliques of France and Geneva*), si ce n'est peut-être les notes dont le rédacteur accompagne le plaidoyer, qui tend à prouver que le séparatisme n'est pas séparatiste.” (p. 32).

There is, indeed, the germ of a French Protestant Episcopal Church which we have heard of, and which we trust may find a fostering power to direct and sustain it. If God has purposes of mercy in reserve for France, as many things in the state of men's minds in that country would seem to indicate, another and a safer haven will be found for them than Rationalism or Hyper-Calvinism, Independency or Romanism. He has means at his command which we know not of; and to Him, by prayer, would we commend a powerful nation, to be rescued out of the withering grasp of superstition or the self-destroying power of unbelief.

ART. VIII.—*The Christian Psalmist*. By JAMES MONTGOMERY. Glasgow. 1826.

2. *Odes Sacrées, ou les Pseaumes de David, en Vers François*. Amsterdam. 1764.

DRYDEN commenced his epistle to his friend, Peter Motteux, with an expression of regret that an art, inspired and taught by heaven, employed by Moses and David, and consecrated to the service of the altar by the lips of prophecy, should be suffered to decline into neglect—

“The muse's foes
Would sink their Maker's praises into prose.”

But in resuming our remarks on Psalmody, begun in a former number, we hope to show that the Muse can vindicate herself from her most inveterate enemies, and point with triumph to her struggles in the hallowed cause of Religion. There will not be found, we think, more than two or three poets—worthy of the name—who have not, at some period of their lives, mingled their voices in the universal chorus of praise and worship to their supreme Father; and who have not felt their lips burn, even though for a brief season, with the fire of sacred love? We shall presently find Dryden confirming our remark by his own example. The finger that most delighted to wake the festive lute, has often drawn notes of beauty from the harp of Sion; and we may remember with gladness that the lyre of the son of Jesse has lost none of its power, but is still mighty to dispossess the evil spirit, and to scatter the cloud and tempest from the soul of man. We may refer, for a partial illustration of these observations, to the history of one of the most popular poets of France—Clement Marôt.

Marôt's translation of the Psalms, was the observation of the poet Mason, owed its popularity at court not to its sanctity of character, but to its rhymes. Calvin said that it caught the gale of fashion; and he immediately perceived the opportunity it afforded to those who were inspired by purer motives and aimed at a nobler result. The version was recommended to general acceptance by the quality which increased the attractions of our own Sternhold and Hopkins. "The verses (writes Mason) were easy and prosaic enough to be intelligible to the meanest capacity. The melodies, moreover, which accompanied them, equalled the simplicity of the words; and they who could read the one found very little difficulty in singing the other."* But in reality the execution of the English and French versions admits of no comparison. Marôt possessed a musical ear and a copious strain of harmonious diction; *le style de Marôt* became a proverbial expression for an easy and pleasant manner. At the present time he is the most ancient French poet whom we read with any pleasure. Boileau regarded him as a model for light and festive compositions; J. B. Rousseau imitated him; and from his pages the genius of La Fontaine transplanted many happy and vivacious "turns" of sentiment. Marôt certainly did not carry his talents with him to his more sacred attempt in serious song. He seems to breathe with difficulty in these lofty regions of thought, and to sigh for the lighter and more voluptuous atmosphere of pleasure which he had forsaken. From French critics his version of the Psalms has never received a hearty welcome. "Le peuple Protestant," is the remark of a writer generally temperate and judicious, "a pu chanter quelque temps ces cantiques bizarrement travestis: mais le bon sens a toujours rejeté des productions, où le naïf s'efforce en vain d'atteindre au sublime, qui n'a rien de commun avec lui." This censure appears to be too severe; and as the Psalms of Marôt are not likely to be in the hands of many of our readers, we shall offer a short specimen of his manner, in the translation of the thirteenth Psalm, accompanying it with a version of the same Psalm by Racine, who is known to have always selected those portions of the Psalter which furnished the best opportunities for the employment of his tender and graceful powers. Among the more successful versifiers of the Psalms in France may be mentioned J. B. Rousseau, who succeeds most in passages of dignity and sublimity; Le Franc; Des Fontaines; Malherbe, the first writer, according to Boileau, who made his readers perceive the just cadence of a verse, and

* See "Mason's Essays on Church Music."

taught them the power of a single word, "rightly placed;" Le Bologne; Olivier; De Cerisy; De la Motte; De Sainte Palaye; De Malleville; Gautier; D'Aire; Moreau; and others. Of these writers, the merits, of course, vary widely. Rousseau holds, we believe, the highest rank. Without coinciding in the inflated eulogy which some critics have bestowed upon him—without discovering in his works the beautiful disorder (*le beau désordre*) of Pindar, the graces of Anacreon, or the chaste good sense (*la saine raison*) of Horace—we admire his enthusiasm and dignity. If his reputation had not been built on a strong foundation, it would have crumbled under the malevolent hand of Voltaire. If ever (says a French writer) any poet was entitled to apply to himself the well-known line—

'*Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo,*'

it was J. B. Rousseau. That heat has kept his fame alive.

MARÔT.

Jusques à quand as établie
Seigneur de me mettre en oubli ?
Est-ce à jamais ? par combien d'âge
Destourneras-tu ton visage
De moy las, d'angoisse rempli ?

Jusques à quand sera mon cœur
Veillant, conseillant, pratqueur,
Et plein de souci ordinaire ?
Jusques à quand mon adversaire,
Sera-il dessus moy, mon vainqueur.

Regarde-moy, mon Dieu puissant,
Respons à mon cœur gemissant,
Et mes yieux troublez illumine
Que mortel dormir ne domine
Dessus moi quasi perissant.

Que celui qui guerre me fait
Ne die point, Je l'ay deffait,
Et que tous ceux qui tant me trou-
blent

Le plaisir qu'ils ne redoublent
Par me voir tresbucher de fait.

En toi gist tout l' espoir de moy :
Par ton secours fay que l' esmoy
De mon cœur en plaisir se change :
Lors à Dieu chanteray louange ;
Car de chanter ; j' aurai de quoy.

RACINE.

Jusques à quand, baigné de larmes,
Gémirai-je sans t'attendrir ?
O Dieu, témoin de mes allarmes,
Voudrais-tu me laisser perir ?

Jusques à quand tes yeux sévères
Seront-ils détournés de moi ?
Jusques à quand de mes miseres
Viendrai-je rougir devant toi.

Seigneur, combien de tems encore
Veux-tu me voir humilié ?
Quoi, c'est en vain que je t'implore,
Tu m'as pour toujours oublié ?

De la rigueur de ton silence,
Tandis que je suis confondu,
Mon ennemi plein d'insolence,
En triomphe, et me croit perdu.

Ah Seigneur, si d'une main prompte
Tu ne relevés ma langueur ;
Publiant sa gloire et ma honte
Il dira qu'il est mon vainqueur.

Si tu ne me rends ta lumière,
Quel sera mon funeste sort ;
Accablé d'une nuit entiere,
Je m'endormirai dans la mort.

Tu m'écoutes : mon espérance,
Ne m'a point flatté vainement ;
Et bientôt de ma délivrance
Je vais chanter l'heureux moment.

If we return for a moment to our own literature, we find the

severe and saturnine genius of Ben Jonson uttering its confession of sin and its prayer for mercy, in accents of touching simpleness and fervour. Jonson had not passed through life without defilement; he had laid his incense upon unworthy altars, and stooped his proud forehead to the vices of the age. But if he had the publican's conscience, he had also the publican's humility. In 1641 appeared, among other poems from his pen, three upon sacred subjects. They are entitled, "To the Holy Trinity," "An Hymn to God the Father," and "An Hymn on the Nativity of Our Saviour." The name of "Underwoods," by which they are distinguished, was selected by their author on account of its analogy to a former collection, which he called "The Forest." These poems appeared under very unfavourable auspices. Whether the poet had contemplated their publication, we may be inclined to doubt; but the spirit of their religious feelings is unexceptionable. In the concluding verses of "The Forest" he had poured out the sighs of a penitential heart with unaffected fervour. His learned and warm-hearted editor, Mr. Gifford, pronounced the poem, with great justice, an admirable prayer, solemn, pious, and scriptural. Jonson, "like all of us, had his moments of forgetfulness:" moments, when his moral principle lost its uprightness—when the inward eye of thought was dazzled by the tempter, and the ear charmed by the lute of the enchantress. Jonson passed his days in the press and tumult of busy and eager life. In such a crowd the white garments of virtue cannot always escape a stain: but the embers of good feeling, though damped, were never extinguished; the flame soon revived, and he then acted up to his own noble declaration, that it was impossible to write a good poem without first being a good man. There is something unusually solemn and touching in the lines in which he confesses his guilt and his weakness:—

"Yet dare not I complain, nor wish for death,
With holy Paul, lest it be thought the breath
Of discontent, or that these prayers be
For weariness of life, not love of Thee."

These Christian thoughts fell from his lips when the shadows of evening were round his bed, and the journey of life was nearly over. In such a season, it is beautiful to watch the day-star rising over the dark edge of the horizon, and to see the waters of time illuminated with a guiding ray as the traveller approaches the haven. That we are indulging no dream of fancy respecting Jonson is sufficiently shown by the few records of his latter days which have been preserved for our instruction. He was frequently visited by the Bishop of Winchester, who,

soon after his death, collected and published the elegies which had been strown up on his hearse. Hacket, Morley, and King were also among his visitors and friends; and we are told by Falkland, that all who were worthy of honour, as Pembroke, Portland, and grave D'Aubigny, crowded to the pillow of expiring genius. We give the hymn to the Trinity :—

“ O holy, blessed, glorious Trinity
Of persons, still one God in Unity,
The faithful man's believed in mystery,
Help, help to lift

“ Myself up to thee, harrow'd, torn, and bruised
By sin and Satan : and my flesh mis-used,
All my heart lies in pieces, all confused,
O take thy gift.

All-gracious God, the sinner's sacrifice,
A broken heart thou wert not wont despise,
But 'bove the fat of rams or bulls to prize,
An offering meet

For thy acceptance : O, behold me right,
And take compassion on my grievous plight !
What odour can be, than a heart contrite,
To thee more sweet ?

Eternal Father, God, who didst create
This all of nothing, gav'st it form and fate,
And breath'd'st into it life and light, with state
To worship thee.

Eternal God, the Son, who not deniedst
To take our nature ; became man, and died'st,
To pay our debts, upon thy cross, and cried'st
ALL'S DONE IN ME !

Eternal Spirit, God from both proceeding
Father and Son ; the Comforter in breeding
Pure thoughts in man : with fiery zeal them feeding,
For acts of Grace.

Increase those acts, O glorious Trinity
Of persons, still one God in Unity ;
Till I attain the long'd for mystery
Of seeing your face.

Beholding one in three, and three in one,
A Trinity to shine in Union ;
The gladdest light dark man can think upon ;
O grant it me !

Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost—you three,
All co-eternal in your Majesty,
Distinct in persons, yet in unity,
One God to see.

My Maker, Saviour, and my Sanctifyer !
 To hear, to meditate, sweeten my desire
 With grace, with love, with cherishing entire :
 O, then how blest !

Among thy saints elected to abide ;
 And with thy angels placed side by side,
 But in thy presence truly glorified,
 Shall I there rest."

In these verses we notice an abruptness and want of harmony, which might have been supplied by the correcting hand of the writer. That Jonson possessed consummate skill in the management of lyrical measures, we know from his exquisite *Masques*. No poet, of the same mental stature, ever displayed more graceful and flexible ease than he has shown in those gay and remarkable productions. He seems to put off his own learned sock, and to warble the wood-notes of Shakspeare. Shall we startle our readers by the confession, that we discover a resemblance in the sacred verses of Jonson to some of the smaller poems of Dante ? Without being very intimately related, they belonged, we think, to the same family of genius. The features of both are stern, reflective, and, to a superficial observer, somewhat repulsive. In sentiment, they were generous, fiery, and overbearing—like strangers to flattery or intimidation. The hand of Jonson might have wielded a sword upon English ground, as did that of Dante upon the plain of Campidoglio. In poetry and in life, they were complete men. The Muse of each could grasp the spear. The language of Dante is solemn and difficult ; it seems to harmonize with the blackness of those sombre forests where imagination revealed to him the secrets of purgatory. Antiquity gave an accent to the tongue of both ; but in a very different sense. Let us glance, for a single moment, at the rise and progress of the illustrious Florentine.

In Germany, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, we find the "*Lay of the Nibelungen*," an epic romance, whose stories belong to an earlier age, and whose natural simplicity has reminded some of its readers of the legends of Grecian poetry. Italy alone seemed to linger behind in this march of the understanding. A Sicilian, between 1187 and 1193, was probably the first writer of "genuine Italian." Yet from this chaos Dante rose, steering his way through all those gloomy and rude elements of thought, until his path opened upon Paradise. He shook off with his mighty wing the idle visions and fancies that fluttered before his eyes. Instead, as Sismondi has shown, of cold madrigals, sonnets painfully melodious, and allegories harsh as they were unnatural, he presented to the gaze of his astonished readers a new world of imagination, and hewed, out

of hitherto undiscovered mines of poetry, the images of angels. It was about the year 1300 that he began his pilgrimage to the temple of Fame in the company of Virgil. Even a brave heart might have seen upon its gates the same inscription that startled the eyes in the Inferno. What hope could there be for the success of such an adventure? Nevertheless he triumphed. The golden bough of Genius has not only conducted the poet through the perils of five hundred years, but has obtained for him the society, upon earth, of the wisest and greatest of men; and Criticism, even in her sternest mood, is always willing to recognise its sanctity and its power. The loiterer along every little stream of fame receives him with gladness:—

Ille admirans venerabile donum
Fatalis virgæ, longo post tempore visum.

Whatever analogy may be traced between the intellectual powers of Dante and Jonson, the character of their productions scarcely admits of comparison. Sir Philip Sidney said, that the first writers who taught the language of Italy “to aspire to be a treasure of science, were the poets Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch.” The great Florentine had not only to build and to design his temple, but to dig for the materials, and to smooth and adapt them to his purpose. Our own language, on the contrary, had been enriched by the most liberal contributions of fancy and learning, and was vivid with beauty, and glowing with the blood of life. The rust of antiquity, which we see in Jonson, was the produce of labour.

The likeness of Jonson to Dante is closer, in our judgment, than that which criticism is accustomed to discover in the features of Milton. The genius of our immortal poet was more joyous, more sanguine, and in an artistical sense more voluptuous, than Dante’s. He seems to have reposed with livelier pleasure in the gardens of Ariosto than in the Eden of Dante. His commentators have not discovered many imitations of the Italian Homer. Mr. Hallam says, that he was not the favourite poet of the south during Milton’s residence in Italy. Perhaps this circumstance is not very important; for the popularity or fame of a writer would not be likely to influence a mind like Milton’s: his taste rather led him among the fantastic creations of Latin fiction, and he read the “*Metamorphoses*” oftener than the “*Eneid*.” Dante possessed great imagination and little fancy; Milton united both. Compare the “*Paradise*” of the first with the “*Heaven*” of the second. Light, music, and motion, are the elements of delight in the *Comedia*; Dante painted that scenery of bliss with the clear pencil of Raphael; Milton with

the flushing colours of Rubens and the silvery softness of Correggio. One is more spiritual; the other more sensuous. James Montgomery has noticed the extreme beauty with which Dante describes angels. The picture in the twelfth canto of the "Purgatorio" is particularly sweet. The poet represents the spirit advancing in white raiment to greet him, with the light of the morning star upon the countenance:—

E nella faccia, quale
Par, tremolando matutina stella.

But our present concern is not with the sacred poetry of Italy in its higher walks of thought, but with its humbler, though, to the Christian, still dearer contributions to the stores of praise and thanksgiving. Let the reader who is acquainted only with the grander note of the Italian lyre peruse the following penitential Psalm, and recollect our remarks on Jonson:—

Signor, non mi reponder con furore;
E non voler correggermi con ira;
Ma con dolcezza, e con perfetto amore:
Io son ben certo, che ragion ti tira:
Ad esser guisto contro a' peccatori:
Ma pur benigno sei a chi sospira.
Aggi pietate de' miei gravi errori:
Però ch' io sono debile, ed infermo:
Ed ho perduti tutti i miei vigori.
Defendimi, o Signor, dallo gran vermo
E sanami: imperò ch' io non ho osso,
Che conturbato possa omai star fermo.
E per lo cargo grande, e grave, e grosso,
L' anima mia è tanto conturbata,
Che senza il tuo ajuto io più non posso.
Ajutami, o Signor, tutta fiata:
Convertimi al ben fare presto presto:
Cavami l' Alma fuor delle peccata.
Non esser contra me così molesto:
Ma salvami per tua misericordia,
Che sempre allegra il tristo core, e mesto.
Perchè, se meco qui non fai concordia;
Chi è colui, che di te si ricorde
In morte; dove è loco di discordia!
Le tue orecchie, io prego, non sien sorde
Alli sospiri del mio cor, che geme;
E per dolore se medesmo morde.
Se tu discarghi il cargo, che mi preme.
Io laverò con lagrime lo letto,
E lo mio interno e notte e giorno insieme.
Ma quando io considero l' aspetto
Della tua ira contr' a' miei peccati,
Mi si turbano gli occhi, e l' intelletto.

Però che i falli miei son-si invecchiati
 Più, che gli errori de' nemici miei
 E più, che la peccata de' dannati.
 Partitevi da me Spiriti rei,
 Che allo mal fare già me conducesti
 Onde io vado sospirando, Omei!
 Però che il Re dei Spiriti celesti
 Ha esaudito lo pregare, e 'l pianto
 De gli occhi nostri lagrimosi, e mesti.
 Ed oltre a questo lo suo amore è tanto,
 Che, ricevendo la mia orazione,
 Hammi coperto col suo sacro manto.
 Onde non terno più l' offensione
 De gl' inimici miei, che con vergogna
 Convien, che vadan, e confusione:
 Però ch' io son mondato d' ogni rognà.

An Italian critic, Saverio Quadrio, has written copious annotations upon the penitential Psalms of Dante, some of them regarding the versification and composition. He thinks the repetition of *presto*, in the seventeenth line, happily introduced to express the anxious solicitude of David; and he defends the use of the word *rognà*, which is also found in the "Inferno," from the censure of Bembo and other Italian critics.

Without lingering any longer upon European psalmody in general—a most fruitful and interesting theme of meditation—we cannot refrain from making one observation upon a Spanish poet, who seems to have been eminently fitted to excel in sacred harmony. We allude to Luis Ponce de Leon, who was born in 1527, and died in 1591. His love of contemplative studies, the ardour of his character, and his exquisite sense of music, were qualities likely to insure excellence in any path of serious poetry. Cervantes admired him beyond measure; and there is no poet of Spain whom a Protestant would read with so much gratification. The bigotry of a corrupt Church rarely boils over in the strains of Leon. A lover of Horace, he appears to have imitated, with peculiar success, the pleasant ease and engaging sweetness of the Latin poet. But Leon had a vein of rich enthusiasm, which would only have awakened a smile in that charming villa, that once overlooked the Bandusian fountain and the verdant shades of Lucretilis. To read his religious verses is like walking through some splendid cathedral in his own land; the painted windows, the solemn pictures, the gorgeous decorations, produce a beautiful and soothing light; and the heart feels their influence even while it acknowledges the discord of the associations, and the false opinions they are intended to promote.

But in meditating upon the effect which the creed of Roman-

ism exercised over the imagination of Leon, the memory naturally reverts to a far greater poet of our own country, who touched the sacred harp under a similar impulse, with a vigour and sublimity infinitely superior. Need we mention the name of Dryden? Cowper, although a master in the art, was not always a very profound or accurate critic; for he admired Prior beyond his merits, and ascribed a poetical fervour to the more amiable muse of Watts, which an unprejudiced reader looks for in vain. But with his judgment on Dryden we feel disposed completely to coincide. Writers, he said, who produce their wonders of skill by severe industry and repeated touches, are frequently chilled by the excess of caution; and he thought that Pope alone had always escaped the frost. In him the glories of Titian seemed to light up the vulgar realities of Ostade. Genius lost none of its majesty or beauty by the perpetual labour to which he subjected it. But after all, he admitted that he admired Dryden most, who, in despite of indolence and neglect, rose higher even than his famous successor, and created, by a few dashes of a hazardous and impetuous chisel, features of livelier expression, than ever grew into life beneath the hesitating hand of Pope. Let us not be misunderstood. Of Pope it could never be affirmed, in the satire of Horace,

“In vitium ducit culpæ fuga, *si caret arte* ;”

for art he never wanted. He could recover himself in the very act of falling, and always rose higher at the next effort. There is, however, another axiom of the Roman teacher which the English poet did not always remember or respect—

“Infelix operis summa ; *quia ponere totum Nesciet.*”

The unity of the subject is sometimes forgotten in the embellishment of its parts. Hurd, in his Commentary on Horace, introduces some ingenious observations on the line we have quoted. He selects the obvious and apposite example of the landscape painter, whose main care ought to be directed to the combination into *one* entire view “of certain beautiful or striking objects.” The constituent parts may be sketched with a more careless hand. A flower by the cottage door, a goat hanging upon the hill-side, may be touched into the canvass with a quick pencil. Hurd refers for an illustration and confirmation of his argument to Casper Poussin. His animals are drawn with inferior skill; their use, he adds, consisting in the decoration of the scene which they supply, and their beauty depending, therefore, “not on the truth and correctness of the *drawing*, but on the elegance of their *disposition* only.” How ineffectual, not to say how offensive, would one of Landseer’s dogs appear

in the foreground of a picture by Claude, or thrust prominently forward in a lovely English landscape by Gainsborough? Johnson, in his admirable preface to Shakspeare, while refuting the criticisms of Voltaire and Rymer, takes occasion to remark that a poet overlooks the casual distinction of country and condition, as a painter who, being satisfied with the figure, neglects the drapery.

When Sir Walter Scott was engaged to superintend an edition of the works of Dryden, he applied to Wordsworth for any critical suggestions he might be disposed to offer. The author of "The Excursion," while professing to admire the talents and genius of Dryden, ventured to affirm that "his is not a poetical genius." The assertion must have been peculiarly displeasing to Scott, who not only loved the muscular energy and vigorous declamation of Dryden, but had offered a very beautiful tribute to his poetical character in one of the introductory Epistles of *Marmion*. But the examination of Mr. Wordsworth's opinion would beguile us too far from our present inquiry.

Why might not Dryden have written sacred hymns of a high and inspiring character? His most illustrious disciple has, indeed, called him "unhappy" in his destiny; and unhappy, of a truth, he was, when in all the days of Charles, the feeble lips of a Roscommon could alone pour out "unspotted lays." But let us not forget to mingle the tear with our anger. It was affirmed by Scott, with honourable enthusiasm, that the love of all things noble and worthy existed in the bosom of Dryden, and that nothing but the base allurements of an abandoned court prevented him from recalling, in immortal strains, the exploits of romantic valour, and encircling the Round Table with the chivalry of Arthur.*

We know not if any spectacle can be presented to human observation more melancholy or more terrible, than that of an intellect endowed by heaven with strength and beauty above its fellows, but shorn of its vigour by the false hands of some flattering Dalilah, and then driven by hard task-masters to display its surviving energies for their amusement, and to desecrate the glory of God into buffoonery and license. Samson among the Philistines is an emblem of the poet among corrupted parasites.

* "The mightiest chiefs of British song
Scorned not such legends to prolong;
They gleam through Spenser's elfin dream,
And mix in Milton's heavenly theme;
And Dryden in immortal strain
Had raised the Table Round again,
But that a ribald king and court
Bade him toil on to make them sport."

Happily for us and for the world, the parallel fails in the horror of its catastrophe. Happy, indeed, is it for us that in the phrenzy of that fever, and with the fierce recklessness of that moral blindness, he did not bow the pillars of our literature with a mightier and more sacrilegious arm, and leave behind him the ruined temple of our poetry, as a monument of his power and of his crimes. From this fearful degradation he was fortunately preserved. He descended into the lower regions of morals, but even in that Inferno he had a guide to protect and cheer him: Dryden seems never to have been abandoned, for a long season, by that ministering angel of life whom men call Conscience. In the cloud and thunder her divine voice was heard; nor always heard in vain. We discover him, at intervals, escaping from those paths which the "flowery courtier" delighted to haunt; and laying with reverent hand his offering upon the sacred altar of nature and of truth, upon which alone the fire ever descends from heaven. Lines of exquisite moral beauty are sown through his works—lines which condense a page of didactic wisdom into a few words, and linger upon the heart and upon the lips.

Dryden committed the common error of our fallible nature; he did not steer his boat into the water of sin, but he suffered it to float with the current: he did not manfully struggle against the stream. If he had imitated rather the character than the verses of the great Latin satirist, it had been more beneficial to his own reputation. But Dryden, alas! could not prove his unfitness for Rome by his ignorance of falsehood. How could he say, *mentiri nescio*, who defrauded truth of her worship, and strewed flowers before the feet of triumphant vice? From Cowley, a name dear to his heart, he might have gathered purer wisdom. He would have taught him at least how to encircle his virtue with a sacred fire from the fury of the spoiler, even if he failed in exhorting him to escape from the city of pestilence. The dangers of an honest man in much company supplied a theme to that most delightful of English writers for a beautiful essay. We question, indeed, whether in the treasury of our religious eloquence more precious pearls of wisdom will be found than in the prose works, short as they are, of the "melancholy Cowley." Let us quote—for the author of the *Davidis* may claim a place even in observations upon *Psalmody*—the exquisite paragraph with which he opens his commentary on the shortness of life and uncertainty of riches. "If you should see," are his words, "a man that were to cross from Dover to Calais run about very busy and solicitous, and trouble himself many weeks before in making provisions for his voyage, would you commend him for a cautious and discreet person, or laugh at

him for a timorous and impertinent coxcomb ? A man who is excessive in his pains and diligence and who consumes the greatest part of his time in furnishing the remainder with all conveniences and even superfluities, is to angels and wise men no less ridiculous ; he does as little consider the shortness of his passage, that he might prepare his cares accordingly. It is, alas ! so narrow a strait between the womb and the grave, that it might be called the Pas de Vie, as well as that the Pas de Calais. If we could but learn," he adds, " to number our days (as we are taught to pray that we might) we should adjust much better our other accounts ; but while we never consider an end of them, it is no wonder if our cares for them be without end too. Horace advises very wisely and in excellent good words—*spatio brevi spem longam reseces* ; from a short life cut off all hopes that grow too long. They must be pruned away like suckers that choke the mother plant and hinder it from bearing fruit." From such a friend, what might not Dryden have learned ? That the spring of piety was within him who can doubt, who reads these noble aspirations ?

• " Creator, Spirit, by whose aid
The world's foundations first were laid,
Come, visit every pious mind ;
Come, pour thy joys on human kind ;
From sin and sorrow set us free,
And make thy temples worthy thee.

O source of uncreated light,
The Father's promised Paraclete !
Thrice holy fount, thrice holy fire,
Our hearts with heavenly love inspire ;
Come, and thy sacred unction bring,
To sanctify us while we sing.

Plenteous in grace, descend from high,
Rich in thy seven-fold energy !
Thou strength of his Almighty hand,
Whose power does heaven and earth command,
Proceeding Spirit, our defence,
Who dost the gift of tongues dispense,
And crown'st thy gift with eloquence.

Refine and purge our earthly parts ;
But, oh, inflame and fire our hearts !
Our frailties help, our vice control,
Submit the senses to the soul ;
And when rebellious they are grown,
Then lay thy hand, and hold 'em down.

Chase from our minds the infernal foe,
And peace, the fruit of love, bestow ;
And lest our feet should step astray,
Protect and guide us in the way.
Make us eternal truth receive,
And practise all that we believe :
Give us thyself, that we may see
The Father and the Son by thee.

Immortal honour, endless fame,
Attend the Almighty Father's name ;
The Saviour Son be glorified,
Who for lost man's redemption dy'd :
And equal adoration be,
Eternal Paraclete, to thee."

Joseph Warton observes, in a note, that this "is a most elegant and beautiful little morsel;" one of the author's most correct compositions, and in which poetry and piety assist each other. The external poetry of his religion evidently coloured his thoughts with a bright and animating enthusiasm. The Germans explain the different taste of the classicists and romanticists by the difference of their religion. The first, they say, with a material religion, placed their poetry in the senses; the second, with a spiritual religion, discover their's only in mental emotions. In Dryden, while the religion of the senses seems to predominate, the depths of the bosom are also agitated.

But after all, it is not to the famous poets of any country that we are to look for those aids to devotion, which sweeten the hour of rest from labour, and scatter flowers in the windows of poor cottages. Milton or Dante could never have written a volume of spiritual songs which, while they glowed with the fire of inspiration, should at the same time speak in a language familiar to the unlettered ear. It has been suggested by a writer, whose poetry has blinded the eyes of criticism to the beauty and vivacity of his prose, that superior souls may resemble gigantic bodies, which by the very exertion of their strength exceed the harmony of parts; and, like the heroes of old, "amidst a series of glorious and inimitable performances," occasionally fall into painful extravagances. The epic dignity of genius, in its proudest altitude, cannot always stoop with facility or grace. Beholding every object under a flood of light, such a poet is wont to illuminate his theme with rich illustrations; to encircle, if we may so speak, his tribute of praise, or his prayer for pity, with the beautiful paintings of imagination. Milton could not delineate an angel without recollecting Athens. While we receive, therefore, with delight and gratitude, the strains of devotion which

genius has bequeathed to us, we are obliged to seek in more sequestered paths of poetry for the minstrels who have sung, with most abundant harmony, the cares, the sorrows, and the hopes of the Christian life. Milton, Dante, Dryden, and many others, have left costly fragments behind them; but they are only jasper columns, *half-up-reared*; materials for a magnificent edifice of sacred song, which the world will never behold, and which can shine only before the eyes of those who have been led up by the divine guardianship of Inspiration into the high places of thought, and to whom has been unfolded the glory of a new land of promise.

Of modern writers of hymns, Cowper is preeminently the first. His fancy—soft, gentle, and never excited—shines through his verse with a beauty of colour that tinctures the page. His chastity of diction and melody of rhythm deserve the warmest praise. We know not whether any English writer, with the exception of Collins, Gray, and Akenside, ever equalled the simplicity, the clearness, and the precision of these smaller poems of Cowper. Gray might have surpassed him in the polish of his lines, but he would have wanted the vivifying ray of religious enthusiasm that burns in the rhymes of the poet of Weston. It can never be sufficiently regretted that Collins did not clothe the expressions of his wounded spirit in the language of verse. Our sacred poetry would indeed have received a string of pearls from his hand. He who had invoked Spring, “with dewy fingers cold,” to sprinkle with flowers the sepulchres of the brave; and had conducted Honour, “a pilgrim gray,” to breathe a blessing over their ashes—he assuredly would have called a brighter angel than that of Spring to freshen the turf with bloom, and would have led a holier dearer pilgrim than Honour to linger, “a weeping hermit,” by the grave of the Soldier of the Cross.

Partaking in a large measure of the same purity and simplicity of language, but enlivened by a fainter heat of fancy, we notice Goldsmith (to whom Montgomery refers), and quote this well-known stanza:—

“The wretch, condemn’d with life to part,
Still, still on Hope relies;
And every pang that rends his heart
Bids expectation rise.
Hope, like the glimmering taper’s light,
Adorns and cheers the way;
And still, as darker grows the night,
Emits a brighter ray.”

“Is this poetry?” enquires Mr. Montgomery. “Every reader feels that it is; yet if the same ideas were to be given in prose,

they could not well be more humbly arrayed. Nothing can be more simple, nothing more exquisite; and hymns in the same pure and natural manner might be adapted to every subject in alliance with religion. But by whom? Not by one who had only the delicate ear, the choice expression, the melodious measures, and the fine conceptions of Goldsmith; but by him who to all these should add the piety of Watts, the ardour of Wesley, and the tenderness of Doddridge. Had Goldsmith possessed these latter qualifications (and they were all within his reach), would he not have left hymns as captivating in their degree as any of those few but inestimable productions, which have rendered him the most delightful of our poets to the greatest number of readers?" To this question there can be only one reply. The nightingale of Auburn could not have sung with a sweeter voice. We never remember Pope's happy eulogy of Horace, without feeling how justly, in part at least, it belongs to Goldsmith. He charms us with much of the same graceful negligence, and often, like him,

—"without method talks us into sense."

The most popular name in English Psalmody is Isaac Watts. Johnson introduced his poetry into the closet of the Churchman; and in the chambers of Dissent a harp so agreeable to the ear had never been heard. Montgomery thinks he may be called the inventor of hymns in our language. Into the doctrinal character of his verses we shall not enter; but we cannot admit the truth of Montgomery's remark, that their *catholicity* is so unblemished that the reader discovers no traces of sectarianism. His literary errors are sufficiently obvious; he is often harsh and prosaic; and his rhymes, to an ear acquainted with the fine music of Collins or Gray, are singularly incorrect. It has been said that his ear had no perception of music; but certainly without foundation. Numerous stanzas might be selected from his Psalms and Hymns, exquisite in expression and faultless in harmony. Refer for example to the sixty-sixth Hymn, upon the prospect of heaven at the hour of death: where, in allusion to the land of peace, soon to be trodden by the feet of the Christian, he says—

"There everlasting spring abides,
And never withering flowers;
Death, like a narrow sea, divides
This heavenly land from ours.
O could we make our doubts remove,
These gloomy doubts that rise,
And see the Canaan that we love,
With unclouded eyes!

Could we but climb where Moses stood,
 And view the landscape o'er,
 Not Jordan's stream nor death's cold flood
 Should fright us from the shore."

With the exception of the first line of the second stanza, which is very flat and cold, these verses might have been written by Gray or Goldsmith. When Watts sinks, it is with a rapidity and weight never equalled but by Blackmore; and we can almost believe that we see him in the attitude of another celebrated hero, renowned in song, who

"Gnawed his pen, then dash'd it on the ground,
 Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound,
 Plung'd for his sense, yet found no bottom there,
 But wrote, and flounder'd on in mere despair."

Nor let us be esteemed severe or unjust in our censure; when a poet, solemnly setting forth the glory of God, can speak of "every bowel" rolling "with soft compassion;" when he urges his soul to fly up and run through every street of heaven; and submits to similar degradations of taste, we feel that our great satirist might almost have been excused for threatening to impound him in the "Dunciad." But these errors were only the infirmities of Watts' poetic nature; nor do they leave any very painful impression upon the mind of a reader, who knows the author well enough to appreciate the meekness of his character, the guilelessness of his heart, and the fervour of his piety. In happier hours of fancy and meditation he uttered lays which Piety might love to warble, and with which the ear of Elegance itself could not be offended. How sweet and glowing are the lines, familiar to every serious ear, addressed to the Holy Spirit:—

"Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,
 Come with thy quickening powers;
 Kindle a flame of sacred love,
 In these cold hearts of ours.
 In vain we tune our formal songs,
 In vain we strive to rise;
 Hosannas languish on our tongues,
 And our devotion dies.
 Dear Lord! and shall we ever be
 At this poor dying rate?
 Our love so faint, so cold to thee,
 And thine to us so great?
 Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,
 With all thy quickening powers;
 Come, shed abroad a Saviour's love,
 And that shall kindle ours."

To Charles Wesley has been commonly assigned the next place to Watts.

Southey, alluding to the Wesleyan collection of Hymns, and particularly to those written by Charles Wesley, makes the interesting and affecting remark, that perhaps no poems have ever been committed to the memory with equal devotion, or quoted so frequently upon the bed of death. "The manner (he adds) in which they were sung tended to deepen their impression upon the mind; for the tune was made completely subservient to the words." Wesley delighted in the singing of his meeting-houses, and applied the talent for music and verse, by which his family were distinguished, to the promotion of that beautiful act of sacred worship. Charles Wesley may be emphatically called the "Poet of Methodism;" yet, without assenting to every expression, whether of sentiment or doctrine, contained in his copious productions, it is impossible to refuse his admission into the catholic assembly of Christian minstrels. Montgomery speaks of him with a zeal that seems to burn into enthusiasm. "Christian experience (he says) from the deeps of affliction, through all the gradations of doubt, fear, desire, faith, hope, expectation, to the transports of perfect love in the very beams of beatific vision—Christian experience furnishes him with everlasting and inexhaustible themes; and it must be confessed that he has celebrated them with an affluence of diction and a splendour of colouring rarely surpassed." This praise is warmed by a fancy which scatters its own lustre upon the subject it handles; but the severest criticism will acknowledge the powers of Wesley. Read the following hymn on the Sun of Righteousness :—

"Christ, whose glory fills the skies,
Christ, the true, the only light,
Sun of Righteousness, arise,
Triumph o'er the shades of night;
Day-spring from on high, be near;
Day-star in my heart appear!

Dark and cheerless is the morn
Unaccompanied by thee;
Joyless is the day's return,
Till thy mercy's beams I see;
Till they inward light impart,
Glad my eyes, and warm my heart.

Visit then this soul of mine,
Pierce the gloom of sin and grief;
Fill me, radiancy Divine!
Scatter all my unbelief:

More and more thyself display,
Shining to the perfect day."

There is in these verses a vigour, a clearness, and a condensation of sentiment, which we very seldom find so happily combined in Watts. Charles Wesley was indebted for much of the power of his Hymns to the vehemence and ardour of his temperament. He is often, in a rare degree, *densus et instans sibi*; the wheels of thought kindle with the rapidity of their motion. Perhaps the clearness and idiomatic propriety of his language may be properly assigned to the fervour of his imagination. It has been admirably observed by Pope, when speaking of Homer, that in proportion to the warmth of a thought will be the lustre of the expression; as one is more strong the other becomes more conspicuous; and he illustrates his assertion by a most apt and ingenious comparison:—"Mental creation of this kind resembles (he says) glass in the furnace, which grows to a greater magnitude and refines to a greater clearness, only as the breath within is more powerful and the heat more intense." But it occasionally happens that the fervour of Wesley glows with too vivid a flame, and rushes up into a lyrical height with a daring and impetuous movement. A very singular instance of this kind occurs in his remarkable Hymn—if Hymn it can be called—entitled,

JACOB WRESTLING WITH THE ANGEL.

PART FIRST.

"Come, O thou traveller unknown,
Whom still I hold, but cannot see!
My company before is gone,
And I am left alone with thee;
With thee all night I mean to stay,
And wrestle till the break of day.

I need not tell thee who I am;
My misery and sin declare:
Thyself hast call'd me by my name;
Look on thy hands and read it there:
But who, I ask thee, who art thou?
Tell me thy name, and tell me now.

In vain thou strugglest to get free,
I never will unloose my hold;
Art thou the Man that died for me?
The secret of thy love unfold:
Wrestling, I will not let thee go,
Till I thy name, thy nature know.

Wilt thou not yet to me reveal
Thy new, unutterable name ?
Tell me, I still beseech thee tell ;
To know it now resolv'd I am :
Wrestling, I will not let thee go,
Till I thy name, thy nature know.

What though my shrinking flesh complain,
And murmur to contend so long ?
I rise superior to my pain :
When I am weak, then am I strong :
And when my all of strength shall fail,
I shall with the God-man prevail.

PART SECOND.

Yield to me now, for I am weak ;
But confident in self-despair ;
Speak to my heart, in blessings speak ;
Be conquered by my instant prayer :
Speak, or thou never hence shalt move,
And tell me if thy name be Love.

'Tis Love ! 'tis Love ! thou died'st for me ;
I hear thy whisper in my heart :
The morning breaks, the shadows flee ;
Pure, universal Love, thou art :
To me, to all thy bowels move,
Thy nature and thy name is Love.

My prayer hath power with God ; the grace
Unspeakable I now receive ;
Through faith I see thee face to face ;
I see thee face to face, and live :
In vain I have not wept and strove,
Thy nature and thy name is Love !

I know thee, Saviour, who thou art ;
Jesus, the feeble sinner's friend !
Nor wilt thou with the night depart,
But stay and love me to the end :
Thy mercies never shall remove,
Thy nature and thy name is Love.

The Sun of Righteousness on me
Hath rose, with healing on his wings ;
Wither'd my nature's strength, from thee
My soul its life and succour brings ;
My help is all laid up above,
Thy nature and thy name is Love.

Contented now upon my thigh
I halt, till life's short journey end ;

All helplessness, all weakness, I
 On thee alone for strength depend ;
 Nor have I power from thee to move ;
 Thy nature and thy name is Love.

Lame as I am, I take the prey ;
 Hell, earth and sin, with ease o'ercome ;
 I leap for joy, pursue my way,
 And, as a bounding hart, fly home ;
 Through all eternity to prove,
 Thy nature and thy name is Love."

This is a long extract, but we give it for two reasons ; because it has received the warmest and most zealous praise of Mr. Montgomery, and because we consider that commendation greatly too unrestricted. Mr. Montgomery thinks that in this poem Wesley, with consummate art, "has carried on the action of a lyrical drama ; every turn in the conflict with the mysterious being against whom he wrestles all night being marked with precision by the varying language of the speaker, accompanied by intense, increasing interest, till the rapturous moment of discovery, when he prevails and exclaims—

'I know thee, Saviour, who thou art.'

Upon any subject of poetical taste, and more especially in the songs of a religious heart, the opinion of the author of the "World before the Flood" ought to be received with respect and examined with attention. He has proved his right to judge by his power of performing ; having himself travelled into the land of Imagination, he is entitled to declare its laws. In venturing, therefore, to express our decided dissent from the eulogy of this poem, we feel inclined to adopt the swelling and characteristic apology of Johnson in reference to the dramatic writers, and to relinquish our attempt to overthrow an opinion supported by such authority, as the ancient chieftain retreated from the gates of Troy, when he saw Neptune shaking the walls and Juno heading the besiegers. If this noble period—according to Parr, one of the most majestic in our language—were not inappropriately applied to the critical Rymers of a former century, we may be permitted to employ it upon the present occasion. Yet, even in our retreat, we cannot refrain from offering two or three observations.

And first, it may be asked, what impression does this composition leave upon the mind ? One of reverence, or of awe towards that great Being who is introduced in it ? We imagine not. The poem is conceived, we think, in the very worst spirit of the conventicle ; in that spirit of presumption and familiarity

which deservedly called down the severest reprobation from Bishop Heber. The metaphor is coloured into a reality, and the vigour of the pencil makes the representation still more offensive. The image in the eleventh stanza approaches to blasphemy, and would be vulgar if it were not irreligious. The same objection applies to almost all the more ambitious effusions of Charles Wesley; an objection not to be removed by the undoubted force and energy of the style to which we allude. Contrast his Hymn on the Confidence of the Saints in the Day of Judgment, with one on the Last Day by a minister in his own connection, named Olivers. The last hymn has been embodied in almost every collection of hymns for public worship, and has been frequently attributed to Charles Wesley himself. We remember to have heard our learned friend, Hugh James Rose, ascribe it to him with great admiration. But Wesley has produced nothing of equal breadth and sublimity; its effect, when thrown up to the vaulted roof by a chorus of Christian voices, is thrilling and overwhelming:—

THE LAST DAY.

OLIVERS.

“Lo! He comes with clouds descending,
Once for favour’d sinners slain;
Thousand, thousand saints attending,
Swell the triumph of his train:
Hallelujah!
Jesus comes, and comes to reign.

Every eye shall now behold him,
Robed in dreadful Majesty!
Those who set at nought and sold
him,
Pierced, and nail’d him to the
tree,
Deeply wailing,
Shall the true Messiah see!

When the solemn trump has
sounded,
Heaven and earth shall flee away;
All who hate him must, con-
founded,
Hear the summons of that day:
Come to judgment!
Come to judgment! come away.

CONFIDENCE OF THE SAINTS IN THE
DAY OF JUDGMENT.—C. WESLEY.

“Stand the omnipotent decree;
Jehovah’s will be done;
Nature’s end we wait to see,
And hear her final groan:
Let this earth dissolve, and blend
In death the wicked and the just,
Let those pondrous orb descend,
And grind us into dust.

Rests secure the righteous man,
At his Redeemer’s beck,
Sure to emerge, and rise again,
And mount above the wreck:
Lo! the heavenly spirit towers,
Like flames o’er nature’s funeral
pyre;
Triumphs in immortal powers,
And clasps his wings of fire!

Nothing hath the just to lose,
By worlds on worlds destroy’d;
Far beneath his feet he views,
With smiles, the flaming void;
Sees this universe renew’d;
The grand millennial reign begun;
Shouts with all the sons of God,
Around the eternal throne!

Yea, amen ! let all adore thee,	Resting in this glorious hope,
High on thine eternal throne !	To be at last restored,
Saviour, take the power and glory ;	Yield we now our bodies up
Make thy righteous sentence	To earthquake, plague, or sword,
known !	Listening for the call divine,
O come quickly,	The last trumpet of the seven :
Claim the kingdom for thine own."	Soon our soul and dust shall join,
	And both fly up to heaven."

Wesley too frequently lowers his noblest descriptions by some mean image or some ill-selected epithet. The "Redeemer's beck," in the second stanza, may be extenuated by the necessity of the rhyme; but it jars upon the ear with painful harshness. Pope in his edition of Shakespeare distinguished some of the finest passages by commas in the margin. A similar plan might be adopted with advantage in re-publishing the works of other authors; taking care, however, to affix the marks to the faulty passages as well as to the meritorious. And this practice might become really beneficial, when applied to works of a popular character and of extensive circulation. Charles Wesley is said to have derived considerable assistance and benefit from the more refined taste of his brother John, "who, it is probable," writes Mr. Montgomery, "greatly tempered the extravagance of Charles, pruned his luxuriances, and restrained his impetuosity, in those Hymns of his which form a large proportion of the Methodist collection; the few which are understood to be John's in that book being of a more intellectual character than what are known to be Charles's; while the latter are wonderfully improved by abridgment and compression, in comparison with the originals as they were first given to the public." This opinion seems to be perfectly just; but one of the most graceful and pleasing productions of the Wesley family, is the Hymn written by Samuel Wesley for the funeral of a young person. In this poem the artist is more visible than in any composition we remember to have seen from the pen of Charles or John Wesley; the flow of the rhythm reminds us of Addison:—

"The morning flowers display their sweets,
And gay their silken leaves unfold,
As careless of the moontide heats,
As fearless of the evening cold.

Nipt by the wind's unkindly blast,
Parch'd by the sun's director ray,
The momentary glories waste,
The short-lived beauties die away.

So blooms the human face divine,
When youth its pride of beauty shows;
Fairer than Spring the colours shine,
And sweeter than the virgin rose.

Or worn by slowly-rolling years,
Or broke by sickness in a day,
The fading glory disappears,
The short-lived beauties die away.

Yet these, new rising from the tomb,
With lustre brighter far shall shine;
Revive with ever-during bloom,
Safe from diseases and decline.

Let sickness blast, let death devour,
If heaven must recompense our pains;
Perish the grass and fade the flower,
If firm the word of God remains."

In speaking of the poets of Methodism we cannot omit the name of Doddridge. With the single exception of his friend, Isaac Watts, Dissent never possessed a more liberal or a more admirable defender. He conciliated the overbearing temper of Warburton, and awoke a sentiment of esteem in the bosoms of all who knew him. Piety wore her natural expression of kindness and cheerful innocence in the life and writings of Doddridge. His was one of those sunshiny minds that lighten forth smiles, if we may take a phrase from our old poet Daniel, to clear the cloudiest weather. Ever vivacious, ever contented, he seemed to be equally prepared to suffer or to enjoy; and even while enduring all things, we feel assured that he would have continued to hope all things. His "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul" is one of those works of which criticism hesitates to speak. We love the author when we read his book. Nor is Doddridge entirely disunited from the history of our poetry. To him we are indebted for the Grave of Robert Blair; of all the minor religious poems of the eighteenth century certainly displaying the intensest power of vivid thought and vigorous expression. His own verses reflect the features of his personal character; they are gentle, tender, and persuasive. Doddridge was a son of Consolation, and in his metrical effusions, as in his more elaborate compositions in prose, we find him always seeking to pour in oil upon the wounded heart, and to bind up the broken spirit. His hand extinguishes no dying lamp, nor quenches any smoking flax. Mr. Montgomery enters into the full beauty and charm of his Christian Songs: "All that can be imagined (he says) deficient in Addi-

son's Hymns will be found to constitute the glory of Doddridge's. They shine in the beauty of holiness; these offsprings of his mind are arrayed in 'the fine linen, pure and white, which is the righteousness of saints;' and, like the saints, they are lovely and acceptable—not for their human merit (for in poetry and eloquence they are frequently deficient), but for that fervent unaffected love to God, his service, and his people, which distinguishes them." There is, indeed, in the Hymns of Doddridge a grace beyond the reach of art, which takes the feelings captive and calls the tears of Christian sympathy into the eyes. In this touching sensibility of manner Toplady often rivals him; particularly in the Hymn beginning,

"Deathless principle arise."

But he is too diffuse, and his thoughts want precision. Of the Hymns of Doddridge we have always admired that on Confidence in the Saviour, which glows with Christian love; and still more the one we are about to quote, which is at once poetical, tender, and devotional:

"Do not I love thee, O my Lord?
Behold my heart and see;
And turn each cursed idol out,
That dares to rival thee.

Do I not love thee from my soul?
Then let me nothing love;
Dead be my heart to every joy,
Which Jesus cannot move.

Is not thy name melodious still
To mine attentive ear?
Doth not each pulse with pleasure bound
My Saviour's voice to hear?

Hast thou a lamb in all thy flock
I would disdain to feed?
Hast thou a foe before whose face
I fear thy cause to plead?

Would not my heart pour forth its blood,
In honour of thy name?
And challenge the cold hand of Death,
To damp the immortal flame.

Thou know'st I love thee, dearest Lord;
But O! I long to soar
Far from the sphere of mortal joys,
And learn to love thee more."

Our limits warn us to conclude, without attempting to assign their due commendation to the numerous writers of hymns and

spiritual Songs, of whom we have not hitherto spoken. The names of Beddoes, Logan, Grigg, Barbauld, and others, present their claims to our regard. The name of Beddoes will not be familiar to the ear of many readers; but his verses, without any poetical beauties, are often energetic, and convey a pious sentiment or a scriptural truth in language excellently suited to impress it upon a humble intellect. Logan had talents of a higher order; but the charges of plagiarism which have been brought against him disgrace his literary character with a stain that is not likely to be washed out. Mrs. Barbauld had a musical ear, and wrote pleasing and harmonious verses; the stanzas on "the Death of the Righteous" are flowing and tender, particularly the eight lines at the commencement, but the poem itself hardly belongs to popular Psalmody.

If we direct our researches among the members of our own holy Church, we find abundant testimony to show that in the melody of her heart, as well as in her government, she is conspicuous in the midst of heresy and schism. Ken, Heber, Horne, Keble, Milman—we only give a sheaf from the harvest—have displayed the loveliness of Religion in beautiful and affecting verse. Ken has, indeed, conferred a precious gift upon mankind: "If he had endowed three hospitals (says Montgomery), he might have been an inferior benefactor to posterity." He might indeed! His three hymns are full of the balm of Gilead; and the spiritually halt, the lame, the blind, and the wounded, will receive from them both ease and joy. The seraphical ardour of his aspirations lifts him above the reach of criticism. Our hearts burn within us when he talks to us; for he tells us of the glory beyond the tomb. Of him, indeed, it can be affirmed, without a metaphor, that being dead he yet speaks—speaks in a thousand churches, and by ten thousand, thousand lips; and every sabbath he draws up our thoughts to heaven by that golden chain of Christian wisdom and praise, which must be lasting as it is precious.

But we have finished—yet not without a single word of exhortation to those who may endeavour to add any thing to the Catholic Psalmody of our country. Be simple—be unaffected—be devout. Search for no costly decorations from classic or romantic fiction, but look in your own hearts and write. This advice was given nearly three hundred years ago, and has lost none of its strength or fitness. Imitate with reverence your divine Master, and raise instruction from the natural objects which surround you: the lilies that neither toil nor spin, the sparrow that never falls to the ground without your Father's notice, may awake images in your minds of beauty and of faith. And after all, recollect and deeply ponder the caution of the venerable

Hooker :—"In church music, curiosity and ostentation of art, wanton or light, and unsuitable harmony, such as only pleaseth the ear, and doth not naturally serve to the very kind and degree of those impressions which the matter that giveth it leaveth, or is apt to leave in men's minds, doth rather blemish and disgrace what we do, than add beauty or furtherance to it."* If these remarks be applied with truth to the music of our churches, they bear with equal power upon our songs of thanksgiving and prayer. Nor let even Genius expect to excel in this noblest description of poetry by its own unassisted might. Even upon the harp, our own right hands will never give us the victory. Our hearts must be disciplined ; our eyes must be cleared ; our conversation must be in heaven. To all who endeavour to sing us a song of Sion, without this preparation, we address the warning lines of Cowper, with the alteration of a single word—

"Spend all the pow'rs
Of rant and rhapsody in Virtue's praise :
Be most sublimely good, verbosely grand ;
And with poetic trappings grace thy verse—
Ah ! twinkling cymbal and high sounding brass,
Smitten in vain ! such music cannot charm
Th' eclipse that intercepts Truth's heavenly beam,
And chills and darkens a wide-wandering soul ;—
The STILL SMALL VOICE is wanted."†

* We add in a note a hymn by a writer named Grigg, which seems to breathe a most touching spirit of Christian meekness and humility, and is valuable for the happy application of Scripture, though deficient in eloquence.:

"Jesus, and can it ever be,
A mortal man ashamed of thee ?
Scorn'd be the thought by rich and poor,
My soul shall scorn it more and more.

Ashamed of Jesus ! sooner far
May evening blush to own a star !
Ashamed of Jesus ! just as soon,
May midnight blush to think of noon.

Ashamed of Jesus ! yes I may
When I've no crimes to wash away ;
No tears to wipe, no joys to crave,
And no immortal soul to save.

Ashamed of Jesus ! that dear Friend,
On whom my hopes of heaven depend ?
No : when I blush be this my shame,
That I not more revere his name.

Till then—nor is the boasting vain—
Till then I boast a Saviour slain ;
And O may this my portion be,
That Saviour's not ashamed of me !"

† Task Book V.

- ART. IX.—*The French Revolution : a History.* By T. CARLYLE. Second edition. 2 vols. Fraser. 1839.
2. *Speeches in Parliament during the Session, 1840.* London : Painter.
3. *Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill : a Speech in Behalf of Deans and Chapters, made before the Long Parliament.* By JOHN HACKET, D.D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's, and afterwards Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. Now reprinted, with Preface and Notes, by A CLERGYMAN. London : Painter. 1840.

ALL who remember the early years of the French Revolution, or who are at all acquainted with the history of our own country during the awful course of that momentous period, must remember also the blandishments made use of by the *enlightened* advocates of the *rights of man*, both in and out of Parliament, to persuade the British subject to cast off the antiquated trammels of religion and loyalty from his mind, and the superfluous covering from his nether man, and to join, *sans culottes*, in the revolutionary *caramagnole* with his ardent and regenerated neighbours on the other side of the channel : how Fox and his allies held up to British admiration, and as a worthy example for the British army, the lust-bought treason of the literally *prostituted* twice-perjured French guards,* thus leaving on record a never-to-be-forgotten example of the readiness with which Whiggery denudes itself of every troublesome vestment of honour or honesty, and steps forth in moral *sans culottism*, scarcely covered by the scanty fig-leaf of hypocrisy, *and is not ashamed*. They too will remember with pride and pleasure, that is if they be worthy the name of Englishmen and Christians, how indignantly did the people reject all the treacherous allurements, spurned the insidious and flattering appeals to *patriotism*, *virtue*, and *enlightened liberality*, and held fast to religion and loyalty, as to the best bower and sheet anchors of England's unrivalled constitution, unmoved by the virile but unprincipled eloquence of Fox—the hireling wit and brilliant repartee of Sheridan—the infatuated ravings of Grey, or the incessant wheedling and bullying, snarling and yelping of the unholy and unclean pack of Infidels, Jacobins, and Dissenters who followed in their wake. These last in vain backed them

* The Gendarmarie à Cheval which went over in a body to the Jacobin insurgents on the memorable 10th of August, 1792, was chiefly composed of the old French guards, who had been seduced from their allegiance by the Parisian women in July, 1789, and thus twice infamously betrayed their sovereign and their oaths.

out of the House, by their societies of "Friends of the People," "Corresponding Societies," and other treasonable associations, by means of which they sought to fraternize with the blood-stained democrats of France and to quench the light of the monarchy, and wash out the records of the constitution in the blood of the nobility, clergy, and landed-gentry, and of all that was truly worthy or respectable in the nation. With what honest English enthusiasm and delight did the nation at large listen to the indignant eloquence of the *true* patriot and advocate of every *salutary reform*, when turning his back with disgust on his former associates, he declared that from that moment he and they were for ever separated in politics.

Burke, that far-seeing statesman and unrivalled orator, in the very outset of the Revolution, and when the French had not yet advanced near so far in their democratic march as *we* are now openly called upon to do by our own Radicals, denounced them as having "destroyed all those balances and checks which give steadiness to a constitution, and melted down the whole into one incongruous, ill-digested mass,

———"Jacet ingens littore truncus
Avulsumque humeris caput, et sine nomine corpus."

"With the most atrocious perfidy and breach of all faith among men," said he, "they laid the axe to the root of property, and consequently of national prosperity, by the *principles they established*, and by the example they set in *confiscating the possessions of the Church*. They made and recorded a sort of institute and digest of anarchy, called 'the Rights of Man:' an institute that subverted the State, and brought on such calamities as no country, without a long war, had ever been known to suffer. A blind and cruel democracy had carried every thing before them: their conduct was marked with the most savage and unfeeling barbarity: they had no other system than a determination to destroy all order, and reduce every rank and description of men to one level: their signal of attack was the war-whoop—their liberty was licentiousness—and their religion Atheism."

This was the language of truth and genuine patriotism, and it told with amazing power against the flimsy sophistry of Sheridan, who brought forward a shadowy array of by-gone "extortions, dungeons, and tortures," to excuse the atrocious massacres, violations, confiscations, and abominations of those whom he was pleased to designate as the French patriots; and the heart of the whole people, as the heart of one man, swelled with proud satisfaction, when Pitt arose in his inexpressible might, and drew

comparison between the happy and genuine freedom enjoyed by Englishmen and the unqualified nominal liberty of France, which was in fact at that present moment the most absolute, direct, and intolerable slavery.

And we shall never forget how, when goaded beyond all endurance by the base ungrateful crew of pseudo-philosophers, who would have persuaded the English peasant to forsake his God, pull down his Church, and rebel against the best of Kings, he turned upon them with retributive fury, burnt the house and heresy-hutch of the Birmingham apostle of sedition and infidelity over his head, and so upset all his boasted philosophy, that he took to his heels and never looked behind him till he found himself safe among his republican friends and admirers, with the mighty Atlantic rolling between him and the terrible but just indignation of his own countrymen: a tragi-comic episode in our eventful history, the memory of which has been preserved in Peter Porcupine's (W. Cobbett's) inimitable apologue of "the bull and the man with the fiery stick."*

And now would not any being endued with reason have supposed, that the whole succession of events consequent to the Revolution in France would have tended not only to confirm every Englishman in an affectionate admiration of the Church and Constitution of his own country, and inspired him with a more decided abhorrence of any change—a dread of even the slightest approximation to those political experiments which had not only poured upon France, but on the whole of Europe, such a deluge of blood and horror; but that they would likewise have converted all the Whigs and Radicals to the same opinion. For what man of common honesty, who was in the habit of listening to or reading the speeches and pamphlets of their leaders and oracles, their Whitbreads and Romillys, their Priestleys and Prices—those grandiloquent declaimers for peace and philanthropy, and human perfectibility—would not have supposed in the innocence of his heart that one-thousandth part of the enormities committed and produced by their friends, the *sans-culottes* would have more than sufficed to convince them of the folly and wickedness of giving the preponderance of political power into the hands of an unstable and restless democracy; of surrendering all the constitutional counterchecks so necessary to keep the multitude

* We are no advocates of popular tumults at any time, and still less would we be so now. We are quite aware that a mob is a blind thing, and that the mob which burnt the library and demolished the philosophical apparatus of Priestley was an unlawful and highly to be condemned assemblage; but we are not so blinded by Liberalism as to fail being struck with the divine justice in visiting a teacher of sedition with an outbreak of popular vengeance.

in subjection ; and thus in fact delivering up the monarch, the aristocracy, the wealth, the respectability, the virtue, and the innocence of a nation, bound hand and foot, into the hands of an infuriated rabble, with nothing to lose and clamorous for plunder. But no ! nothing could work this change. Not all the accumulated horrors—not the massacres of the 10th of August and of the 2nd September, 1792—not all the subsequent *fusillades* and *noyades* of the reign of terror, though accompanied also with the frightful image of the guillotine blood-drooping day and night : no, not all the blood of the wise and the brave, the beautiful and the innocent, with which the land of France was saturated during more than a dozen years of “liberty and equality ;” nor could it be done by the iron despotism of the Corsican usurper, that ripened fruit from their tree of liberty, whose insatiable conscriptions sent forth the whole rising youth of the nation, the hope of every family, the pride of every mother’s heart, to perish amid the burning sands of Egypt, the dark sierras of Spain, or the chill and trackless snows of Russia—thus visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, and making the yatagan of the Mamaluke, the knife of the Guerilla, and the spear of the Cossack, avengers of the victims of the revolutionary mania. No, a Whig

—“Convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still.”

Convinced indeed they have all along been—converted they can never be ; for what they seek is *not* what they profess : it is not the exaltation of human nature to divine, for that they well know to be impossible ; the experiment having been tried long ago by our *first* parents, at the suggestion of the first *Whig-Radical*, when he said, “Ye shall be like gods !” No, it is the degradation of the divine nature in man to their own sensual level. But still, as if to prove the antiquity and nobility of their descent, and that they are no *parvenus*, but heirs, in the direct, line of a princely house as old as the creation, they still hold out the fruit of the tree of knowledge as the grand panacea for all human miseries, and cry, “in the day that ye eat thereof ye shall be as gods.” And the blind multitude follow their blind leaders to their Mechanics’ Institutes, their Parthenons and Lyceums, and imbibe, with the utmost greediness, as splendid novelties, the poisonous *riffacciamenti* of stale blasphemies and worn-out sophistries culled from Voltaire, Volney, and Paine ; till, intoxicated with reiterated draughts of French philosophy and philanthropy, and transatlantic religion and patriotism, they “*go a-head*,” puffed up with a vain conceit of their superior

enlightenment and civilization, when they all fall together, and lie wallowing in the filthy ditch of Socialism : and this they call the "march of intellect !" To such a miserable state of corporeal debility and mental imbecility has this march of intellect reduced our quondam stout and honest peasantry. We shall proceed to investigate the causes which, under circumstances apparently favourable to national aggrandizement, have led to so miserable a declension ; and to tear off even the last flimsy remnant of the veil of Whig hypocrisy, and place before our readers, in all their native deformity, the impiety and imbecility of the political quacks who having seized on the helm of the State, and are steering the vessel of the Constitution with every rag of canvas they can crowd on her, right into the *maelstrom of revolution and anarchy*.

These are startling assertions, and it is probable that few, very few, perhaps not one of our readers, may view with such gloomy anticipations the present prospects of our once happy and still rich and *superficially* prosperous land : but let them pause and reflect. There is a volcano beneath their feet—the lava of human passions, a compound of insatiable avarice with reckless profusion, purse-proud arrogance with degraded insulted earth-trodden misery, democratic ambition, popular indignation, universal discontent, religious discord, *popish intrigue*, lust, rapine, revenge—all these are "set on fire of hell," and are boiling beneath the surface of society, ready every moment to overflow and to cover the land with devastation and slaughter, with all those accompanying horrors which the great adversary of mankind delights in compelling his deluded victims to inflict upon each other : horrors which are described with such soul-harrowing fidelity in the first work which stands at the head of this article, more particularly in the picture of the night of the second of September, 1792. O that the Almighty would yet avert the blow from England ; but alas ! may we not say,

"Our *fathers* would not know his ways,
And he has left *us* to our own."

Yes, we must go back to look for the causes which have brought us to this state ; great revolutions are, like all other mighty productions of nature, of slow and almost imperceptible growth ; and thus they arrive at maturity and burst upon the nations with appalling suddenness, and almost invariably when least expected by those *most concerned*. Thus does "the *god* of this world" blind men's eyes, lest they should repent of their iniquities, and turn to God with fasting and weeping and mourning, and he should spare them as he did the men of Nineveh.

It is now, however, our business and intention to go back to

the more remote origin, and trace the causes which have produced the revolutionary mania in this country, when we shall have occasion to demonstrate that nothing but the admirable working of the constitution received from our Saxon ancestors could have so long preserved us from the horrors of democratic frenzy. We shall next call the attention of our readers to the fearful inroads which have been made on that admirable constitution within the last ten years, thus distinctly marking the Progress of Revolution; and conclude by showing that we are now hovering on the very brink of the gulf, and that the men whom we nevertheless suffer to rule the destinies of the nation are striving, "*per fas et nefas*," to plunge us in.

The primary cause, then, will be found to be that which has been the ruin of every mighty empire since the beginning of time, namely, the corruption or neglect of *national religion*. There can be no safety for any nation but in the continued favour and protection of the *one true God*, and no securing that favour but by *national religion*, that is, the *establishment* and *enforcement* by the *executive powers* of a pure and *scriptural worship*: the Scriptures throughout assure us of this, and give it as the sole tenure of national prosperity. Can we then wonder, when we see the Church fallen into such neglect—such open contempt of those in authority as we now see it in this nation—that we should find it accompanied with every concurring symptom of national declension? But whence has it arisen that the Church of England, occupying such high ground at the Reformation, so richly endowed, invested with all necessary authority, should have now fallen so low—should, in fact, retain no spiritual power, no means whatever of enforcing her ordinances, and consequently no moral control whatever over the people; so that atheism and blasphemy stalk abroad *openly unreprieved*, and God's ministers bear the spiritual sword in vain?

After the severe lesson on the loyalty of religious separatists which the nation had received in the great Rebellion, when they trod both Church and Crown under their feet, the restored Government, under the second Charles, were careful to give that support to the Church so necessary to secure sound religious teaching to the people; and in 1662 was passed the Act of Uniformity—an act so entirely in accordance with the will of God, as revealed in Scripture, and requiring only that conformity to divine and human authority which is in itself rational, that we do not hesitate to say that such authority is absolutely necessary to an *Established Church*; and that without it, however replete a nation may be with *individual* piety, there is in fact no *national religion*, and consequently no bond of connexion between that nation, as a nation, and God: a most awful

abandonment, and one that soon destroys all sense of religion among the lower orders, and inevitably prepares them for "treasons, stratagems, and spoils." For though itinerant fanatics, as ignorant as themselves, may for a time gather them into meetings to hear them preach what they call the gospel; yet the variety of crude opinions uttered before them, and the right of every man to judge and interpret for himself, so continually and practically enforced, soon leads them to consider all as equally wrong, or at best very doubtful; and the book of God itself a mere priestly invention to cheat them out of their natural liberty and chain them down to an enforced morality for the sole benefit of their more fortunate neighbours. And this we have lived to see most fearfully accomplished, as we shall more fully show when we come to speak of the daily increasing symptoms of approaching Revolution. We do not here mean to enter into a history of the various acts of Parliament which have reduced the Act of Uniformity to a dead letter; but have merely called the attention of our readers to it, as we are fully convinced that the departure from the letter of that act is the remote cause of all England's misfortunes. We shall therefore return to the more immediate object for which we took up the pen.

In the first place, it appears necessary to recal to the minds of our Conservative friends the nature of that liberty which has ever been cherished as the boasted birthright of Englishmen; that which rendered *old* England the freest and happiest nation on the face of the globe, and the envy of every neighbouring people. This liberty was indeed the Briton's birthright; it was an inheritance derived from his Saxon ancestors, and was comprehended in the institutions of the great Alfred and the laws of Edward the Confessor, and confirmed by the Magna Charta, which was ratified no less than *two and thirty times* in various succeeding reigns. Thus our good old English love of freedom was inseparably blended with a *veneration for antiquity*, not with the restless and insensate desire for innovation. It did not consist in agitation, in appeals to the passions of the populace, and the teaching them to regard liberty as something new to be gained; but in a steady vindication or restitution of *ancient rights*.

"Thus (says Alison, in his admirable "History of Europe,") the progress of the constitution was marked not by successive changes, but by repeated confirmations of subsisting rights, and the effects of freedom in England, instead of being directed, as in most other countries, to procure an *expansion* of the rights of the people in proportion to the progress of society, were almost entirely confined to an unceasing endeavour to prevent their *contraction* by the arbitrary dispositions of succeeding monarchs."

We then see that English liberty was not a *destructive* but a

conservative principle. And the power of this Conservative principle was wonderfully manifested in the powerful re-action by which the monarchy was so peaceably and speedily restored after the great Rebellion; twelve years of LIBERTY—that is, five of a tyrannical, sequestering, domineering House of Commons; and seven of a military despotism—having sufficed to re-awaken in the people the love of their ancient constitution. But the people of England were at that time essentially a religious people: even the Puritans, in the mass, were really sincere in their delusion; and the majority of the nation were strongly attached to the Church. But since that period, and especially since the Revolution of 1688, every possible effort has been made by the Whig party in the nation to draw off the affection of the people from the established religion, and to lend a fostering hand to every species of heresy and schism. But we do not intend in this paper to enter into a history of the “heavy blows and great discouragements” which the Church of God has met with in England since the accession of William III., who himself took every opportunity of depressing her and exalting Dissent. We will merely revert to the blow to the Church’s power which was given by George I. in 1717, when he finally dissolved the Convocation for their manly and consistent condemnation of the time-serving publications of the clever but unprincipled Hoadly. Hoadly was a man who had been all zeal for the Church in the former reign, when preferment was to be gained by it; but who, as soon as he found Whiggery to be the road to advancement, turned round and preached Liberalism, and the lawfulness of Dissent. And the poor old German King was so be-Whigged that he was made to believe that the staunchest supporters of his crown and dignity were disturbers of the peace of the realm; and he actually suffered the Ministry to remove his chaplains, one of whom was the pious and exemplary Sherlock, for the part they took in the Bangorian controversy.

Thus the Church being degraded, and its power and influence diminished by those who should have been its chief supporters, it soon became the principal butt for the wit of the popular party in Parliament; and nothing was considered as indicating so enlarged and liberal a mind, as when a professing Churchman decryd his own Church and enlarged on the superior piety and consistency of Dissenters; while the consistent Churchman who ventured to stand forward in defence of our venerable Establishment, though with reason, and truth, and Scripture on his side, was pointed at as an enemy to liberty of conscience and a narrow-minded bigot! It is no wonder then, when this sort of language has been held, year after year, by all who hated the Church or feared it, or had any thing to hope from flattering the prejudices

of those who did, that the common people (who *never* think for themselves) should be easily persuaded that the calumnies which were so frequently repeated by mob-orators at elections, by sectaries in their meeting-houses, and by itinerant preachers by the wayside, must at least have a foundation in truth; and that they have consequently been at length taught to consider the Church of God as a mere political engine, instituted for the purpose of upholding the throne and the aristocracy, and keeping the operative classes in order by a spiritual domination.

We do not here mean to say that the Church of England has had no part in her own degradation. Far be it from us to assert a doctrine so utterly subversive of the faith once delivered to the saints, as to suppose for an instant that any branch of the holy Catholic Church can ever be trodden under feet of men, but from the effects of her own sinful backsliding; for when the clergy of a Church, from a foolish desire of finding favour in man's sight, part with their distinctive privileges, and lose themselves as it were in the crowd, they naturally and justly fall into contempt, and their office is no longer regarded as holy. Thus fell the clergy of the Established Church of England when, in the year 1664 they resigned the right of taxing themselves in Convocation, and in this point submitted to the Acts of the Commons like the rest of the community. But for this fatal mistake, their Houses of Convocation would have been sitting at the present day, and they would still have possessed the power of acting as a united body, and of making themselves both respected and feared. Since that fatal day they have had no voice, as a body, in the State. From that time the power and influence of the Church has rapidly declined, and with its legitimate power it has naturally lost its hold upon the minds and consciences of the people, and more especially in large towns, where the masses tend to corrupt one another and the mobs are ever greedy after novelty.

Another natural consequence of the loss of the Houses of Convocation was the rapid falling away from the light and the truth among the clergy themselves; not being often called upon to meet their brethren and superiors in full assembly; the parochial clergy being much abandoned to themselves, and seeing their spiritual office lightly esteemed by the laity, began also to esteem it but lightly themselves, and thus the richer among them degenerated, in too many instances, into mere *fox-hunting parsons* or *parson Trullibers*; while their curates, who served at God's despised and desecrated altars, and on whose shoulders fell the whole burden of parochial duty, were paid the wages of day-labourers, and treated with about an equal degree of deference by their dignified masters, though they had received the

education of gentlemen, and were frequently men of the most profound learning and the most exemplary piety. These abuses naturally begat a numerous progeny, which quickly overspread the land, the most fatal among which, to the Church, *was Methodism*—which, springing up in the very bosom of the Establishment itself, caused a more extensive and deplorable schism than any which had afflicted the Church since the great Rebellion. And though the true and consistent followers of John Wesley may yet be numbered among the firmest supporters of the Church and monarchy—far more so, indeed, than many who unblushingly assume the name of Churchmen, while their mouths are ever filled with the praises of Papists and Dissenters, and calumnious vituperations of the pure and apostolical Church of which they profess themselves members—still the innumerable sects of double-dyed schismatics who have fallen away from the Wesleyans, the Kilhamites, and Inghamites, and Warrenites, and Primitive Methodists, and Bible Christians, and their schisms again to the fourteenth generation, are all disloyal railers against the powers that be, and every one greedy for the spoils of the Establishment, which they never doubt to be able eventually to pull down, and—

“Reduce the Church to gospel order,
By rapine, sacrilege, and murder.”

And while the great adversary has thus been putting in practice against the Church his favourite tactics of “*divide et impera*,” and thus depriving the nation of the only effectual bulwark against his insidious approaches, he has been carrying on a most vigorous and unremitting attack, by sapping and undermining the morals of the people through the deceitfulness of riches;

“For Satan now is wiser than of yore,
He tempts with making rich, not making poor.”

But if this be a new mode of attack with him as regards individuals, though we know not that we have any example on record of his resorting to the contrary practice, with the single exception of his attempt upon the man of Uz, which we all know turned out an utter failure; yet we have the same irrefragible warrant for its being his most ancient and approved method of dealing with *nations*. We see the miserable trophies of his success in the desolation of all the great commercial and manufacturing nations of antiquity, and of some of modern times. For with the influx of inordinate riches have ever come their concomitant luxury, with its allurements to every selfish and sensual gratification. This, it appears, was fully exemplified in England more than a century ago, as Smollet assures us in his history,

when treating of the famous South Sea bubble. He thus sums up his relation:—

“During the infatuation produced by this infamous scheme, luxury, vice, and profligacy increased to a shocking degree of extravagance. The adventurers, intoxicated by their imaginary wealth, pampered themselves with the rarest dainties and the most expensive wines that could be imported; they purchased the most sumptuous furniture, equipage, and apparel, though without taste or discernment: they indulged their criminal passions to the most scandalous excess: their discourse was the language of pride, insolence, and the most ridiculous ostentation; they affected to scoff at religion and morality, and even to set heaven at defiance.”

And if such was the effect upon society of such a partial and delusive gleam of successful speculation, what do our readers suppose must be the effect of the immense riches which have flowed in upon us since the pacification of Europe? We know that they have fairly turned the heads of the people. No one now in the manufacturing districts is content to live as his fathers lived, or to remain in the station in which he was born; they see the descendants of the lowest of the people living in princely profusion, and each one strives, “*per fas et nefas*” to attain to the same enviable and alluring position; and this acts so strongly on weak minds, that they are by no means content to wait for their luxuries until they *have obtained* their riches. These are the men whom the Whigs delight to honour—to whom they are always shewing their readiness to sacrifice the landed interest, the Church and Constitution. And this carrying out to such unprincipled extent of the commercial and manufacturing system is a choice implement for urging on the *Progress of Revolution*.

And now, having examined briefly the causes which have led to our defection from the principles of earlier days, let us take a review of the actual progress made in Great Britain since the close of the revolutionary war towards a Revolution of our own. During the continuance of that politic and *just* war—alas! that man’s vile passions should ever force his brother man, in self-defence, to look on war as *politic* and *just*—which kept the French republican propagandists aloof from our sea-girt shores, we had the horrors of philosophical *liberty* and *equality* too immediately before our eyes, with all its glorious apparatus of *guillotines*, *lanternes*, *fusillades* and *noyades*, to wish for any nearer acquaintance; and therefore the news of every victory which proved the efficacy of our wooden walls to defend us from the *blessings* of French fraternization was received by the people of England (with the exception of the few degraded wretches who constituted the members of the “London Corresponding Society,” “the Friends of the People,” *et id genus omne*) with the sincerest demonstrations of joy and gratitude.

And when afterwards threatened with invasion by the wily and rapacious Corsican, who with his armed heel had trodden out the last spark of liberty in France, the universal and enthusiastic volunteering which placed our patriotic and beloved monarch at the head of a million of men splendidly equipped for war *at their own expense*, full of ardour and enthusiasm, and all ready to shed their blood in defence of their ancient constitutional freedom, must have reduced the "Friends of the People," *i. e.* the apostles of anarchy and revolution, to the most hopeless despair.

It was not until peace, the most glorious which the British arms had ever achieved, had set the people at liberty to pursue their commercial and political speculations unscared by fears of invasion, and uninterrupted by the bustle of warlike preparation, that by their constant and uninterrupted communication with their *enlightened* neighbours on the other side of the channel, "they began to make the notable discovery that they were a most oppressed and degraded people ; that British liberty was all a sham ; and their unrivalled constitution, so long the admiration of neighbouring people, a mere political imposture—nothing more than a painted blind to hide from them their wretched state of slavery." Such was the language held to the labouring classes at the numerous reform meetings presided over by such orators as Hunt and Cobbett, whose vanity, folly, or villany led them to work upon the worst passions of the "unwashed artisans" and inconstant rabble of the large towns, relying upon their knowledge of human nature. And then came the ill-advised measure of "Emanicipation ;" and in thus departing from the Protestant principles which had seated the house of Brunswick on the throne, and throwing open the doors of Parliament to the delegates of a faithless and factious priesthood, a blow was given to the constitution from which it *may* never recover ; for it was no other than a desertion of the cause of God and his "Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." And then they obtained "Reform," and have never since ceased to clamour for more, though that measure *was* to have been final, and the universal panacea for all disorders in Church and State. And as this robbery of private property and violation of time-hallowed privileges were not sufficient to ensure majorities in that House where *heretofore* the noblest and wisest of the land had been proud to sit, they proceeded to despoil the municipalities of the kingdom of their ancient chartered privileges ; thus tearing up and laying waste the strongholds of British freedom, and placing them at the mercy of that class of all others the least to be trusted with irresponsible power, the licentious and venal mobs of the great towns, a race of men who in every community and under every various

form of government have preserved the same character, of whom Sallust wrote in this forcible language nineteen centuries ago:—

“Semper in civitate quibus opes nullæ sunt, bonis invident, malos extollunt; *vetera odere, nova exoptant*, odio suarum rerum *mutari omnia student*; turba atque seditionibus sine cura aluntur; quoniam egestas facile habetur sine damno.”—*Bell. Cat.* § 37.

And thus they proceeded in their subserviency to popular clamour, till all those of the party who had any moderation and love for the ancient constitution of the country remaining were driven out of the Ministry, and the government of the country was abandoned into the hands of a clique of empirics. To more than one of these can we without scruple apply M. Thiers's description of Maurepas, the prime minister whom the unhappy Louis XVI. chose on his accession to the throne, and who by his incapacity and by accustoming the King to half-measures and a system of temporization, laid the foundation of all those errors of government which deluged France with blood and led his deluded but innocent master to the scaffold. “Frivolous in all his ideas of government, he neither formed his opinions of men by their conduct, nor of measures by their utility, but of both *by their tendency to uphold his influence at court.*”

What have the club of “Incapables” done for the nation during their six years' tenure of office? Why they have produced a rebellion in Canada, and then removed from command the men by whose energy it was quelled; they have made loud professions of non-interference with foreign powers, and disgraced the British name by their intermeddling with the internal dissensions of Spain. There they have made a most edifying display of their consistency; for they sent out their gallant Isle-of-Dog banditti to assist in putting down the *Romish Church* in Spain, while they are straining every nerve to assist their master O'Connell in putting down the *Protestant Church* in Ireland. But in Spain Popery is not on the side of Revolution and anarchy; and dreadful as it may be in a *spiritual* point of view, it is yet *civilly* speaking peaceable and loyal, and its priesthood are gentlemen and scholars; while in Ireland Popery is factious and turbulent, an encourager of rebellion and murder, and its priests are low-bred, dissolute, and ignorant. Besides these benefits, we know not what they have bestowed upon us, but a multitude of dissenting magistrates: men in general chosen for their admirable fitness to grace the bar (the prisoners') or the hulks, rather than the bench—selected for their known disloyalty to the crown and hatred of the national religion; men often of the lowest origin, without education, without real respectability, without any qualities but such as must necessarily degrade the office into which they are thrust, in most cases unrecommended by, and in many

cases in direct opposition to the wishes of the noblemen presiding over the counties on which they are forced. Some of these have been knighted on presenting addresses from their own factories, on occasion of the Queen's escape from the tremendous report of an empty pistol, fired by the hand of a pot-valiant pot-boy; which said report was heard by the Under Secretary of State, and a report made of it to the Home Office some time before it was made by the said pistol—atleast so reported their own pet organ of the press.

And now, having shown what they have done for the nation, it behoves us to show what they are doing to forward their favourite work of Revolution. And here we feel constrained, however unwillingly, to allude to an action which has been already too frequently referred to, but which tends more than any one they have performed to convince us of the rapidity with which Revolution is "*progressing*" in this devoted land. We allude to the introduction, by the Liberal Premier, of the infamous apostle of Socialism, with his licentious book in his hand, to a virgin Queen! But it was only consistent with the "broomstick act" which has reduced marriage from a holy state, sanctioned by God's blessed ordinance, to a mere legally registered concubinage. This systematic degradation of the female character is the surest engine which the arch-adversary of God and man—the great patron and instigator of rebellion, anarchy, confusion, and every evil work—can imagine, to give energy to revolutionary movements. This was exemplified throughout the whole course of the French Revolution, from its very commencement in 1789.

Next to this fearful demoralization of the female sex, is the system of grinding down the poor by a law, embodying a clause impelling as it does every unfortunate creature who becomes the victim of man's perfidy to the crime of child murder; and by its separation of husband and wife, parents and children, rendering the poor desperate, and fit for every enormity which revenge for real and imaginary wrongs can inspire. The exposures of this detestable system which are now going on in the *Times* newspaper are sufficient to stamp it with eternal infamy, and the thanks of the nation are due for the perseverance of this powerful journal in unmasking the cruelties of Liberalism. There is yet among our English gentry a christian and gentlemanly spirit, which tends to modify in some degree this scion of Whig selfishness and jobbery. The guardians of the Crediton Union have come forward in this true old English spirit to defend their poor from the *low tyranny* of Whig officials—to *glove* the iron grasp of Whiggery, if they cannot yet remove it.

And now for the Progress of Revolution during the past session. If we were not but too well convinced that the mischief

already spread among the mass of the people was altogether irreparable, the extremely ludicrous figure which our *sans culotte* Ministry have cut throughout the whole session would be very cheering to the friends of good government. Our limits, however, will not admit of our entering into the details of the many defeats they have suffered—defeats which would have ousted any Ministry but these. It is melancholy too to see, that although in a modified form they have yet by their indomitable perseverance contrived to get some of their *revolutionary* bills through Parliament, every one of which is a surrender of some principle of the constitution in Church or State.

We will now conclude by taking a rapid glance at the state of our Foreign relations, as bearing on the *Progress of Revolution*; reserving our remarks on its frightful progression in Ireland for a future number, when we promise such an exposition of the state of that miserable and priest-ridden land, and the horrors *immediately* impending over it, as we can only hope may not prove altogether too late to have some effect in mitigating them. All we will at present say is, *beware of the ides of September!* Ireland has just one year more of *tranquillity*—increasing tranquillity, but it is the calm before the *hurricane*. We see, as from the top of Carmel, the cloud even now gathering, and though the hand of treachery with the imposture of repeal agitation can yet conceal it from England's sight, it will speedily cover the whole welkin and burst on devoted Ireland in a storm of blood, and "*fire mingled with the blood, very grievous, such as hath not been in Ireland since the foundation thereof even until now.*"

But now for the policy of our Foreign Office, as conducted by that very *consistent* politician, my Lord Palmerston—a man whose *consistent* adhesion to *office* can only be paralleled by that of Talleyrand, or the celebrated Vicar of Bray. The whole tendency of our Foreign Policy since the accession of the Melbourne Cabinet has been a system of *Liberal* propagandism and a *fraternization* with rebellion and *infidelity*; or, in the language of *Liberalism*—the cause of "*civil and religious liberty* all over the world;" a practical attempt to assist in carrying out on all occasions and in every country the great maxim of *sans cullotism*, "the people the only legitimate source of power:" an open and blasphemous contradiction of Scripture, which declares that "the powers that be are ordained of God."

One of the maxims of Whiggery has been *non-interference* with the policy or governments of other nations, and with true Whig consistency they have carried out their non-intervention principle, by mixing up the nation with every political movement in Europe into which they could possibly thrust their

hands, especially if they could any way forward the cause of democracy.

The case of Spain is one over which they must no doubt greatly rejoice, as we know indeed their organs of the press do; by their half measures of assistance to their brother Radicals they have not only succeeded there in keeping that miserable country subject to all the horrors of civil war for five or six years, but in reducing monarchy altogether to a mere *shadow* of a *shade*. To compass this very desirable end, we know not, and we opine none but themselves ever will know, the sums that have been squandered to supply arms and ammunition to the rabble of the Spanish towns, wherewith to assassinate the nobility and priesthood, and to lay waste the fields of a lately industrious peasantry. The *once* honourable Order of the Bath has been conferred on the Radical *Condottiero*, Sir De Lacy Evans, of *Hernani*; and the ribbon and star of the same *honourable* order has just been forwarded, accompanied by an epistle from his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, to the intriguing Espartero, Duque de Victoria, Marques de Morelli, and Conde de Lucharna, who, in gratitude for all these splendid titles and orders, has just *fraternized* with the municipality of Madrid, &c. to dictate a new Ministry and obedience to mob domination to the wretched Queen Regent.

"Espartero (says an article dated Barcelona, Sept. 9,) has published a manifesto declaring *upon what conditions* he will obey the orders of the Queen! He *exacts* from her the revocation of the municipal law, the dissolution of the Cortes, and the dismissal of the Ministers! The municipalities of Tarragona, Reus, and Arenis-de-Mar, have declared in favour of the insurrection."

Behold the state to which it rejoices our *enlightened* Government to have brought unhappy Spain! And may we not fear that as a just God visited upon France by a revolution of unparalleled horror, her treacherous interference in our struggles with our American colonies, so may the same just God, to whom the cry of blood will not rise in vain, visit upon devoted England the unprincipled interference of our rebel-loving Ministry with the internal struggles of their neighbours.

We need hardly add that Portugal, who has also been blest with our interference, enjoys no more tranquillity than Spain, but is favoured with weekly *emeutes* and massacres.

But the destruction of a few hundred Spanish and Portuguese nobles—the sacking of churches and convents—the slaughter of priests and the ravishing of nuns—are matters of too trifling moment to weigh with a *Liberal* Cabinet. We will, therefore, turn to the all absorbing *Eastern question*, and the prospects of peace or war; and here, indeed, our "wise men of Gotham"

have got themselves into a scrape, out of which it will puzzle them to come without deeply compromising our national honour. The sturdy old Spahi, Mehemet Ali, has no notion of being bullied by the very men who have all along flattered and encouraged him, underhand, in his rebellion against the Porte ; and who, having too late discerned their error, are now no longer able to repair it without calling in the assistance of Russia, and thus forwarding the views of that grasping despotism on the city of Constantine on which she has long gloated with greedy eyes. But let us hear the old "mighty, magnificent three-tailed Pacha," who, it is confidently stated, has ordered his son Ibrahim to march on Constantinople, and who thus addressed the French Emissary, Count Walewski :—

"An unjust and violent treaty has been entered into against me. I will not *attack* those who have signed it. I shall remain patient and moderate, but I will shed the last drop of my blood in order to preserve the empire which I have founded. If the powers confine themselves to blockading the coasts of Egypt and Syria, I have the means of waiting, and I shall wait without drawing my sword. But let them attack St. Jean d'Acre or Alexandria—let them endeavour to rekindle the insurrection of Lebanon, and I shall immediately order my son to pass the Taurus. They think to frighten me by a coalition of the four powers. I shall know how to dissolve it by marching on Stamboul. I am the representative of Islamism ; I will proclaim the holy war, and every good Mussulman must range himself on my side. I will kindle such a flame that Christendom shall have enough to do to mind her own affairs, and the Ottoman empire will be saved. I know and will do my duty ; the rest is in the hands of God and his prophet, to whose will I submit."

Meanwhile, it appears that Commodore Napier, with the natural *inconsequence* of his clique, not to be behind his brother hero of Navarino in ill-timed uncalculating zeal, had already, on the 14th ult., summoned the Egyptian authorities to evacuate Syria, and had addressed proclamations to the Emir Bechir, who sent them immediately to Mehemet with renewed professions of devotion to his cause. It is said that in consequence of this failure to corrupt the Pacha's officer (an attempt altogether worthy of the men who squandered the resources of Britain to purchase the villain Maroto and other Spanish traitors), the siege of Acre is resolved on, and that Colonel Sir C. F. Smith, of the engineers, who proceeded from Gibraltar in the Pique for the Levant, is to conduct the operations on the land side. Thus we are fairly at war with the old lion of Egypt. Meanwhile we hear "that the British Government has addressed an explanatory note to that of France, and that an attempt is making to patch up a new treaty, by which her offended vanity may be

soothed, and the pacification of the East proceed under the harmonious auspices of the *five* powers."

But is France in a humour to be cajoled into a participation in a treaty so manifestly against the interests of her newly-acquired African possessions, for whose benefit she so eagerly courts the friendship of Mehemet Ali? Let us hear a specimen of her political press on this all-absorbing topic:—

"It is time (says the *Toulonnais*) to redeem the faults we have committed through cowardice. Let us cover the seas of the Levant with our squadrons, at the same time that we shall receive into our arms the Balearic islands, Italy and Belgium, who claim our assistance. Let our armies simultaneously cross the Rhine and the Var. An attempt is making to excite Egypt and Syria to revolt; we must awake from their slumber Poland, IRELAND, the Caucasus, and the Germanic Confederation."

This is decidedly warlike enough, and, as a spirited and highly intelligent journal remarks—

"Should any deplorable catastrophe result from the angry passions and warlike preparations now set on foot, Europe would attribute it with justice to the inexplicable neglect, apathy, and procrastination of the English Foreign Minister."

And now that we are hovering on the very brink of a war—a serious affair with the most warlike nation in Europe—not a bullying expedition against some distant or despicable adversary, as the Emperor of China or the poor helpless King of Naples—how are we prepared to meet it? Have we a Navy? * Yes, on paper: but how is it at sea? We have plenty of ships at home laid up in ordinary—we have worm-eaten and rotten hulks; but abroad we are very much in the situation of the poor Dutchman, who when blown from his anchorage in Yarmouth roads and hailed by an English frigate with, "You Dutch lubber, why don't you let go another anchor?" replied, "O dear sare, me have blenty of angors and gables, but me leve dem in Rodderdam!" The ships too that we have at sea are almost all of the old construction, fifty years "*en retard*" of the modern science of naval architecture, and totally unfitted to cope with the magnificent new French ships of the line and frigates. Our steamers too are not built for warlike purposes; and though our Whig-radical scribes, who do not know the stem from the stern of a ship, talk about the rapidity with which we could

* At the time we are writing our seaports are placarded with bills, inviting seamen to enter the *Howe*, *Britannia*, *Queen*, *Victory*, and other ships, but to very little purpose: the *Vanguard* lay nearly two months at Spithead, and at last sailed without her complement. We would advise our *economical* Government to send a supply of placards to the *American ports*, whither our able seamen have been driven to seek and obtain employment.

send to sea a fleet of war steamers, we, who are somewhat better informed on nautical affairs, can tell them, that a vessel not constructed for the purpose *cannot* be made to carry heavy guns, as the firing them would tear her in pieces. And our gilt *gingerbread* steamers, which are very pretty things to carry passengers to Gravesend and Chelsea, would any of them be knocked to shivers with a dozen thirty-two pound shot ; while *all* the French packet steamers in the Mediterranean are *built for war*, are in the service of Government, and already mounted with heavy guns, thirty-six, forty-four, and sixty-eight pounders : and what chance has a becalmed line-of-battle ship against such insidious adversaries, who can choose their own position and distance, and rake her fore and aft, turn her lower deck into a slaughter-house, bring down her masts by the board, and force her to surrender or sink ? Such is the wretched prospect now opening for England's once invincible Navy. May God in his mercy avert the omen.

Meantime we shall find it much easier to draw Prince Paskevitch, with his hordes of fierce Muscovites and savage Scythians, to Constantinople, than we shall find it to get him out again when we have him there. The late disasters which the Russian arms have suffered in the Caucasus make the city of the Sultan more than ever an object to be coveted ; as once established there, the Caucasus must fall naturally beneath the fresh multitudes which would be continually poured in upon it. And the subjection of the Caucasian tribes opens a ready way to the rear of our India possessions, on which the eyes of Russia have long been fixed. The expedition to Chiva, the first step towards a footing in the immediate vicinity of India, has failed, it is true, for the present ; but there is no doubt that General Perowski is to try it again by a new and safer, though more circuitous route ; and by this time next year we shall not only hear of him in Chiva, but in Candahar, and not improbably in Cabul.

And now we have got as far as Cabul, let us enquire how we are situated there, and how it is to be expected that the Russians would be received should they penetrate into that country ? One thing is certain, that nothing can be further from popular than we are with the Afghans : we have expelled from the throne of Afghanistan a mild and popular prince in the person of Dost Mohammed Khan, to replace him by Shah Soojah, who is represented on all hands as a monster of cruelty and licentiousness—a charge pretty well borne out by the fact of *our having expelled him from the same throne some years since* for these very amiable weaknesses, and replaced him by the very man whom we have now sent to the right-about for *disobedienc*

of orders! And to support the Schah against the just detestation of his unwilling subjects, we have to keep a large army in the country and to fight a sanguinary battle almost every week. Such is our position in Upper India; and should we go to war with France, there is little doubt that the Sikhs, the most warlike and *aguerrie* of all the nations of India, and who are under French influence to no small degree, would declare against us and join with the Afghans to expel us.

Of our *grossly unjust* and impolitic attack on China we say nothing, as we shall enter fully into the Chinese question in our next number. It is only to be paralleled by the aggression on the helpless King of Naples for disposing of his own sulphur mines according to his own good pleasure. In all our present war prospects we foresee nothing but peril and misfortune—we truly hope that we shall not meet defeat and disgrace; and this we do not prophecy in the spirit of the Whigs, who were always auguring defeat to our armies because they wished it; but rather in the spirit of Him whose disciples we hope we are, who, while he foresaw but too plainly the desolation of Jerusalem, wept over it!

And now it is time to take our departure from the east, and cross the Atlantic to take a rapid glance at the "far west." The Boundary Question bids fair to furnish the Americans with a pretext for some years to attack us in our weak point whenever they find us with our hands full, as they did before. Whoever will take the trouble to consult Popple's large map of America, published in the reign of George II., somewhere about 1757, will see the boundary line between the district of Maine and Nova Scotia accurately drawn, as well as the course of the river St. Croix and its sources, with the highlands named in the treaty accurately laid down, and will be at once convinced that the state of Maine has no claim to any portion of the territory in dispute, which belongs every acre to New Brunswick, and is of such vital importance to the communication between that province and Canada, that to allow ourselves to be bullied or "soft sawdered" (as our friend Judge Haliburton has it) out of it, would be virtually abandoning all hope of retaining the Canadas in the event of another war.

In all those Utopian republics which our Whigs and Radicals have assisted in wresting from Spain, the enlightened citizens follow the old trade of cutting each other's throats. The capital of Mexico was, according to the last advices, a scene of blood and confusion; in Texas there is war to the knife; our West Indian islands are cursed with incendiarism—a natural result of the propagation of *Liberal* opinions. A Whig paper in the

north had these remarks "on the state of trade" a few weeks since : "The unsettled aspect of political affairs, and the consequent decline in the value of public securities, have had an injurious effect upon *this* market, and we understand that one or two orders for goods for the Mediterranean have been countermanded."

Alas ! our Ministry are "*men of wit*," deciding great national concerns from motives of private resentment, and doing very bad actions in a good humoured manner. "Sir (said Burke), men with good humoured faces have *signed papers* that have made nations tremble."

Having thus rapidly glanced at our Foreign Policy, we will give one more example of the way in which the Ministry foster Revolution at home : Messrs. Wakley and T. S. Duncombe—the latter of whom owes his seat to the corrupt interference of Ministers, and both of whom are styled their "honourable friends" in the House—have been figuring, "*sans culotte*," at a dinner given to the two chartist incendiaries, Lovett and Collins ; when the chartist-coroner-chairman, among other seditious matter, held out to the British people an example in these *noble martyrs* to their cause worthy of their imitation ; his colleague, Duncombe, was no whit behind him in jacobinic eloquence. The *Marsellaise* was played. And *these* are the men whom her Majesty's Ministers delight to honour ! *Vogue là galère ! !*

Again, one of the thorough-going supporters of the Melbourne Ministry, speaking of O'Connell's repeal agitation, thus continues :—

"We are no friends to repeal ; but we would take away every pretext for seeking it, by doing justice to the Irish ; and we would begin by declaring that every Church preferment in Ireland, as it became vacant, should be secularized, and the proceeds paid into the public treasury. We would gradually *abolish the Protestant Church of Ireland*, and so remove that greatest of all *evils and insults* that one nation ever inflicted on another."

Is not a Ministry that countenances such proposals for Church robbery in their semi-official organs, deserving the character thus drawn of them by a journal of rival opinions :—

"Base panders at the same moment to Irish democracy and Russian despotism ; the Melbourne Ministry seems ingenious in discovering the most effectual means of earning the contempt and execration of history —if history should ever think it worth while to rescue the memory of so wretched a Government from oblivion, to gibbet it to everlasting shame."

And thus we are driven by these *Imbeciles* at railway speed to destruction, and the road runs so smooth, with almost impercep-

tibly descending gradients, that the motion is scarcely felt; yet the speed ever increases as we go; "*vires acquirit eundo*," and down we fly. The engineer who presides is an *Incapable*, and already begins to get frightened at the downward rush, while the firemen and stokers keep up the steam to the highest pressure, and the moral railroad surpasses all physical ones for running smoothly and pleasantly. The engineer who constructed it is no vulgar workman; he is an unrivalled master, the greatest capitalist in the universe, a prince, and immortal—he is prince of the powers of the *air*, and consequently of the elements of *fire* and *water*, and their compound—*steam*. He turns out his works perfect in their kind; on his broad railway there is nothing to alarm the delighted passenger—no thrashing of wheels—no loud beating of the engine—all rushes on smoothly forwards and downwards, on the "*facilis descensus averni*."

We conclude with the application of Mirabeau's dying prophecy concerning the National Assembly of France in 1791 to the English Ministry of 1840:—

"They have chosen to govern the *Queen*, instead of governing by *her*; but soon neither she nor they will rule the country, but a vile faction, which will overspread it with horrors."

Ecclesiastical Report.

VARIOUS measures, some of them of very great importance, have been discussed in Parliament since our last. In this department of our Review, our object is to embrace all those topics which in any way affect the interests of our apostolical Church. While Papists and Dissenters are so active in supporting their respective systems—while they can unite even with Infidels against the Church of England, it would be inexcusable in Churchmen to sit still, and not stand up to defend that system of doctrine and discipline for which not a few, at the era of the Reformation, were content to suffer not merely the loss of property, but the loss of life. The eagerness with which our common enemies advance to the attack—the virulence which seems to animate their movements—and the fact that Papists and Dissenters can make common cause in an attack on the Anglican Church, forgetting their distinctive differences in their hatred; are circumstances which prove that those who compose this heterogeneous mass of materials are fearful lest the object of their dislike should still retain her hold on the affections of the people,

and maintain her ascendancy in the country. The very circumstances to which we allude should also animate Churchmen in their course, and unite them as one man against the common enemy; for it is certain that the opponents of the Church would not evince so much activity, or display so much violence, unless they were afraid of her influence, and conscious that, so far from declining, she is advancing amongst the people. If Churchmen are true to themselves, and will only copy, in *some* respects, the example of their opponents, no fears need be entertained respecting the issue of the contest which has been commenced, and which is now carrying on by the Dissenting, Romanist, and Infidel combination.

We purpose in this number to notice those questions which, from their public character, demand our first attention; leaving some other matters to our next Report.

EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS.

Two members of the Episcopal bench have been removed by death since our last Report. One of the vacancies has been filled up by the elevation of the Rev. C. Thirlwall to the see of St. David's; the other by that of Dr. Shuttleworth to the see of Chichester. Respecting the first appointment we cannot but declare our unmingled grief and disappointment; not however on account of the character of the new prelate, for we know that it is irreproachable—but on account of his principles, which, in our opinion, are not such as should be entertained by the governors of the Church in these days of spurious liberalism and schismatic encroachments. The men who are sworn to defend the Church should promote to the Episcopal bench those whose feelings are in unison with the spirit of the Church. It cannot be for the welfare of the Church to advance to that high dignity men who entertain such opinions as those which, on more than one occasion, have been advanced by the present Bishop of St. David's. We allude especially to his views on a question agitated only a few years since, relative to the abolition of subscription in our Universities, and the consequent admission of men of all sentiments into those venerable seats of learning. Our earnest hope is, however, that the Right Reverend Prelate will reconsider the question, and that his sentiments on that subject, and on some few others, will undergo a decided change. In justice to the Whigs, we feel constrained to admit, that the majority of their appointments would reflect honour on any Administration. One of the organs of the Ministry complained loudly, since the vacancy in the see of Chichester, of some of the late Episcopal appointments. The Bishops of Salisbury

and Ripon are especially alluded to, while Dr. Hampden and Dr. Arnold were pointed out as proper persons for the mitre. We hope, however, that her Majesty's Ministers will continue to act as they have done in the case of Chichester; select men not on account of their political views, but for their high character; and that they will, in all their appointments, regard the welfare of the Church, and not the advancement of party interests. To us it is passing strange that the *Morning Chronicle* should recommend the elevation of any man to the Episcopal bench: to be consistent with its own oft-repeated principles, it ought to recommend the abolition of the whole order! That journal is the organ of Dissenters and Papists; it advocates their measures, and uniformly opposes the Church; how then can it recommend that the vacancy should be filled up? At all events it ought, if it did not urge the abolition of Episcopacy, to remain quiet. But the truth is, that the conductors of the *Morning Chronicle* are well aware that the Episcopal benches *must* be filled, and that the people of England are not prepared to sacrifice their Church, and therefore, feeling assured that Bishops there must be, they advocate the selection of those individuals whose views are most in accordance with their own. The fact that the *Morning Chronicle* recommends a man to such an office is calculated to excite suspicion in the breasts of Churchmen. Again however would we express our hope—a hope confirmed and strengthened by the late appointment of Dr. Shuttleworth, that her Majesty's Ministers will, in *all* future appointments, consult the interests of that Church of which they are the sworn defenders and guardians.

THE EPISCOPAL CLERGY OF SCOTLAND AND AMERICA.

In our last Report we intimated, that a bill on this subject had been introduced into the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury. That measure has been passed into a law; and the impediments which prevented a canonically ordained minister from entering our pulpits, unless ordained in England or Ireland, are removed. We rejoice in the alteration, inasmuch as in future the clergy of those churches whose views on matters of doctrine and discipline are similar to our own, will not, on visiting this country, find a middle wall of partition between them and ourselves. Our readers are aware that the exclusion was the act of the State, not of the Church: the inconsistency is now happily removed. The Bishops and Priests of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, who have been canonically ordained, are now enabled, under certain limitations and restrictions, to perform divine service in our churches. It is enacted, "that it shall be lawful for the Bishop

of any diocese in England or Ireland, if he shall think fit, on the application of any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland or of any Priest of such Church canonically ordained by any Bishop thereof, residing and exercising at the time of such ordination Episcopal functions within some district or place in Scotland, to grant permission under his hand, and from time to time under his hand to renew such permission, to any such Bishop or Priest to perform divine service, and to preach and administer the sacrament, according to the rites and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, for any one day, or any two days, and no more, in any church or chapel within the diocese of the said Bishop." It is further specified that the party in question shall not officiate on any day except on those which are specified by the Bishop; but the Bishop has the power to renew the permission as often as he pleases. Before the permission is granted, certain letters commendatory from the Scottish Bishops are to be exhibited. By another clause in the bill its provisions are also extended to the clergy of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

It will be seen that the clergy from Scotland and America are merely permitted to officiate under the license or permission of the Bishop: they cannot hold livings or curacies. The object of the bill is merely to permit a friendly intercourse between the clergy of these churches and those of the Anglican Church. To have permitted the clergy ordained in Scotland or America to hold livings or curacies would have been unwise: none of our brethren in Scotland or America could expect it. Had such permission been granted, the Bishops would not have been able to adhere to that rule, which most of them have adopted, of ordaining no person who has not graduated in one of our Universities; for many, to avoid the ordeal of a University career, would procure orders in Scotland, or even in America, so that the Bishops would find that numbers who had never graduated would obtain curacies, and even livings, in this country. It is not desirable to admit men to our churches as permanent ministers who have not been ordained by our own Bishops; but it was exceedingly desirable that the Bishops and Priests of other Episcopal Churches should be permitted to officiate. This end has now been accomplished by the bill of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishops and Priests of the Churches in Scotland and America may now enter our pulpits and celebrate those ordinances which hitherto they could not perform, because an act of Parliament required that, in order to the performance of any clerical act, the orders of the officiating minister must be conferred in England or Ireland. No Churchman ever doubted that the orders of the two churches in question were valid and

canonical, but the exclusion of the clergy of those churches from our pulpits appeared to some persons to speak different language.

THE CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

This question has been discussed in a previous number at considerable length. Since the publication of our last Report, however, a bill has been passed on the subject, which must be satisfactory to every friend of the Church. We would not have the Bishops the oppressors of the clergy, nor do we wish to see an inquisitorial tribunal established in our various dioceses; but we are most anxious that there should be an easy and inexpensive mode of proceeding against those clergymen who may be guilty of immoral conduct.

The measure is a very simple one. It will put an end to the delay and the expense which, under the old system, not unfrequently deterred an ordinary from instituting proceedings against a delinquent clergyman. The bill was supported by all parties: it had the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Bishop of London, and also of the Bishop of Exeter. The Lord Chancellor remarked, that the bill was very similar to the measure which had been withdrawn in the preceding session; but the Bishop of Exeter stated, with great force, that he supported it because its principle was exactly the reverse; since, by the present bill, the Bishops were the sources of jurisdiction, while by the measure of the last session the Court of Arches was the source of jurisdiction. A brief account of its enactments will enable our readers to judge of the character of the measure.

By the bill of the preceding session, all cases were to be brought into the Court of Arches for adjudication: on this point there were various opinions; and it was clear that a bill of such a nature would never be carried. It is therefore a matter of thankfulness with us, that a scheme has been devised in which the Episcopal Bench are agreed: for all those differences which once existed have been most happily adjusted by the present measure.

When a charge is alleged against a clergyman, the Bishop is authorized to issue a commission for entering upon an examination, in order that its truth or falsehood may be ascertained. A notice is to be sent by the Bishop to the accused party. Before this commission the accused may defend himself; and after the case has been fully investigated, the Bishop, if the parties consent, may at once decide the case. Many charges will undoubtedly be disposed of in this simple and summary manner.

But the accused may object to the settlement of the matter before this tribunal. In this case the Bishop may establish another tribunal—a court consisting of three assessors, one of them being a barrister, so that an opinion may be obtained on all legal questions. After due examination, the Bishop is authorized to deliver his judgment. Should the accused be dissatisfied with the decision, he is at liberty to appeal to the Court of the Archbishop.

It may often happen that the Bishop may be unwilling to pronounce an opinion: in such a case the bill provides that the cause may be taken by the Bishop into the Court of Arches, or submitted to the Privy Council.

Such is an outline of the measure, and we are convinced that it will tend to strengthen the Church. Happily, cases of immorality are rare; but in so large a body as the clergy of England they will occasionally occur. By this bill the Bishops will be enabled to act with promptitude and decision; whereas under the former state of things an immoral man could not be removed from his parish until a long and expensive process had been brought to a successful issue in the Ecclesiastical Courts.

THE CLERGY RESERVES.

A bill was proposed by Lord John Russell, as intimated in our last, exactly similar in its character to the bill of the local legislature, and which was pronounced to be illegal by the judges. According to this plan all the sects in the colony, and even the Papists, were to receive a portion of the funds derived from lands which had been set apart for the exclusive maintenance of a Protestant clergy.

Lord John, however, deemed it desirable to alter his plans. This change was brought about by the intervention of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. In short, the bill, as propounded by Lord John, was neither more nor less than the bill of the Archbishop. However we may dislike the present bill, we view it as infinitely better than the scheme originally proposed by Lord John Russell. According to the present arrangement, the proceeds of that portion of the lands which have been already sold are to be given to the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, in the proportion of two to one; the whole sum being divided into three equal parts, two parts are to be given to the Anglican Church, and one to the Church of Scotland. Thus the amount derived from the lands already sold, consisting of one-fourth of the whole, is secured to the two churches. Three-fourths of the lands are still unsold; and the bill proceeds to dispose of them. The proceeds are to be divided into

two equal parts; one of which is to be devoted to the Church of England and Scotland in the same proportion as in the preceding portion, and the other is to be left at the disposal of the Governor and Executive Council of Canada, for the purpose of religious worship and education.

Unsatisfactory as this measure may be, it is still a great improvement on Lord John's original plan. We conceive that the lands belong to the clergy of the Church of England, and that though the clergy of the Scottish Church might claim a portion of the proceeds of the sale, the Dissenters and the Papists can urge no valid reason for appropriating any part to themselves; the latter, because the lands were set apart for the support of a Protestant clergy—the former, because they repudiate the very notion of receiving money from the State, and therefore cannot receive it consistently with their acknowledged principles. By the adoption of the Archbishop's suggestion, we are delivered from the sin of making further provision for a Popish clergy by act of Parliament. For though some of the money which is derived from the sale of the lands may find its way into the hands of the papal priesthood, yet the country will not be chargeable with the guilt of the transaction; but the responsibility will rest with the Governor and his Council. Even Lord John Russell admitted that it was better not to excite opposition by introducing into the measure any mention of the Roman Catholic religion. The omission was a concession to the feelings of a Protestant people; but we cannot suppose that it would have been made if it had not been wrung from a reluctant Administration.

CHURCH-RATES AND JOHN THOROGOOD.

We are of opinion that it will not be necessary again to allude to this question: at all events, as far as John Thorogood is concerned, the matter is finally settled. From the loud outcry raised by some few Dissenters against Church-rates, a stranger would imagine that the churches of this country were kept in repair by that body. Opposition to Church-rates is a bond of union between parties of the most opposite views. But is it a fact that no tax is paid by Churchmen to assist in upholding Popery and Dissent? The grant to Maynooth may be specified, and the various other grants of which Dissenters are partakers. It would be quite as reasonable for Churchmen to refuse to pay taxes, as for the Dissenters to object to the payment of Church-rates; for the former contribute more in aid of Dissent than the latter contribute towards the support of the Church. Dissenters are only a fraction of the community. How then are the grants

which are made from time to time supplied? They come from the pockets of Churchmen. The Dissenters, at any rate, receive as much from the State for religious purposes as they contribute in the shape of Church-rates, so that on this ground they ought to be satisfied.

Several attempts have been made to liberate John Thorogood from prison unconditionally, but all have ended in disappointment. On the 7th of July, Mr. Easthope moved for leave to bring in a bill to relieve Dissenters from the payment of Church-rates; the motion was seconded by Mr. Gillon; but before the question was put, the Speaker interposed by reminding the House that a similar motion had already been refused during the session, and that the same motion could not be entertained twice in the same session. As a matter of course the motion fell to the ground.

On this occasion the mover alluded to Thorogood, and stated his belief that in a short time many, both in Chelmsford and other places, would follow his example. We believe that no instance has yet occurred; and we are confident that if the law is permitted to take its course, no other instances will occur. Numbers of Dissenters have been called upon for the payment of Church-rates since Thorogood's imprisonment, yet none have refused to pay; they have preferred payment to a prison; nor is it very probable that any one will be found to copy Thorogood's example. We, on the contrary, believe that the happiest results will flow from the imprisonment of this individual. It is not likely that Dissenters will refuse to pay the rates after this proof that the laws of the land are not to be disobeyed with impunity: his imprisonment will teach a useful lesson to many talkative non-conformists.

Thorogood's friends in the House of Commons were not satisfied with such a disposal of the question; and at length her Majesty's Ministers introduced a bill into the lower House to enable the Ecclesiastical Courts to discharge any prisoner who might have suffered an imprisonment of a certain duration. Thorogood's case was repeatedly alluded to in the discussions; and it appears that the measure had a special reference to that individual. Mr. Duncombe, who as usual volunteered a defence of the *martyr*, charged the Church of England and the Bishop of London with persecution, as if the Church or his Lordship had ought to do with the question of Thorogood's imprisonment. If blame attaches any where, except to himself, it attaches to the law of the land; since it was for his temerity in resisting the law that he was suffering.

Sir Robert Inglis paid a visit to Thorogood in the prison, and an account of the interview was sent by the prisoner to

Mr. Duncombe, who read it in the House. In this letter the poor man talks of things of which he has no knowledge, asserting that, by the law of the land, a portion of the tithes is assigned for the repair of churches and the maintenance of the poor. When Sir Robert Inglis mildly stated that he was mistaken, the *confident* prisoner reiterated his assertion. Whether he believed his own statement may fairly be doubted.

There is one portion of Thorogood's letter to which we would direct especial attention. It proves the consummate *vanity* and the excessive *self-esteem* of the prisoner. Supposing, as he says, that Sir Robert was a *parson*, he quoted a text of Scripture, and of course misapplied it. He intimates that Sir Robert did not like the quotation, and in the pride of his own *self-complacency* he adds, that he knew that not many of the *parsons* were "*spiritually-minded*." This circumstance is quite conclusive as to the ignorance and the vanity of John Thorogood: for ignorance and vanity often go hand in hand together. We apprehend that Mr. Duncombe, to whom the letter was addressed, does not wish to put in his claim for being a "*spiritually-minded*" man: and we are at a loss to discover any proofs of the *spiritual-mindedness* of John Thorogood, unless indeed it consists in opposition to Church-rates and going to prison rather than obey the law of the land.

The bill introduced into the House of Commons provided for the unconditional discharge of Thorogood. Having passed the Commons, the bill was sent to the House of Lords, where it was destined to meet with an opponent in no less a personage than the Duke of Wellington, whose speech on the occasion is a remarkable example of the practical wisdom of that great man. When the bill had passed through the committee and the report was brought up, the Earl of Devon proposed the addition of a clause, to the effect that Thorogood should not be released until the rate and the costs had been paid, either by himself or some other party. The clause was supported by the Duke of Wellington, who stated that the costs must be paid by some one; and that they ought not to be paid by the promoters of the suit. He asked, by whom were they to be paid? The clause therefore was adopted by the House of Lords, and John Thorogood continued to suffer the penalty of his obstinacy until he or his friends chose to pay the costs, amounting to the sum of eighty pounds! His friends then paid the sums and the "*martyr*" was released. The Duke of Wellington remarked that the laws must be obeyed. It is certainly most reasonable that the costs should be paid by the party whose obstinacy, rather than his conscientious scruples, brought the whole upon

his own head. We repudiate the notions of scruples of conscience, because any conscientious man, whether Churchman or Dissenter, will feel it to be a sacred duty to pay a rate, to which he knew his house was subject when it was taken. Thorogood and every other objector is fully aware, when taking land or a house, that it is subject to such an impost : and conscience, if permitted to speak, must enforce the payment. Until therefore the laws on this subject are repealed, they must be obeyed by John Thorogood as well as by others.

THE REGENCY BILL.

We allude to this question for the purpose of noticing one of its provisions, which we deem to be, especially in these times of changes, of a most important character. The bill, we trust, will never come into operation. Still it was necessary to make a provision for an event which may happen, notwithstanding the wishes and the prayers of a loyal people.

By the provisions of the bill, Prince Albert is constituted sole Regent. His powers are great ; but there are some few very important restrictions. The important clause to which we refer is the *fifth*, which is couched in the following terms :—

“ That the Regent shall not give, or have power to give, the royal assent to any bill or bills in Parliament, for repealing, changing, or, in any respect, varying from the order and course of succession to the crown of this realm, as the same stands now established by the act of the twelfth year of the reign of King William III., intituled ‘ An Act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject ;’ or to any act for repealing or altering the act made in the fourteenth year of King Charles II., intituled ‘ An act for the uniformity of public prayers, and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, and for establishing the form of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of England ;’ or an act of the fifth year of the reign of Queen Anne, made in Scotland, intituled ‘ An act for securing the Protestant religion and Presbyterian government.’ ”

We view this clause as most important, as a record of the great principles of our Protestant constitution. That the Papists did not oppose it can only be accounted for on the ground that they were aware that opposition would have rendered them obnoxious to some of their Protestant supporters, whose eyes might probably have been opened to the ulterior designs of the Church of Rome, if such a course had been pursued on this occasion.

Should the Regency Bill ever come into operation, the Regent will not be able to give the royal assent to any measure for altering the succession to the throne, not even if the two Houses

should be so forgetful of their duty as to concoct and pass such a scheme. If therefore a long minority should ensue, we are safe on this point. By the act of the twelfth of King William III., the succession to the crown of Great Britain is confined to Protestants: so that the next heir, in case he or she should embrace the Roman Catholic religion, would be incapacitated from sitting on the throne of these realms, which would be occupied by the next in succession being a Protestant. Now it is most important that no attempt should be made to alter the succession. Many inroads have been made on our Protestant constitution, but the sovereign must still be a Protestant; and, by the present bill, no such change can be attempted during a minority. It appears to us that this clause merits more attention than it seems to have attracted. We rejoice that it exists in the bill, but we are surprised at its introduction by the Ministry.

Nor can any alteration take place in religion during a minority. The Act of Uniformity cannot be altered or repealed, and thus the Church of England must be preserved. During a minority attempts might be made to change the government of the Church, or to abolish her altogether. But even supposing that there could be no danger of any such attempts, yet still the insertion of such a clause in such a bill is highly important, and most satisfactory to the Protestant population of this country, inasmuch as it contains a recognition of our Protestant privileges and our Protestant principles—a recognition which may be appealed to on all future occasions.

Ireland, however, is not mentioned in the bill; so that it is not quite clear that the Regent is under any restrictions with respect to religion in that country. As far as the succession to the throne is concerned Ireland cannot be affected, because it is a part of the empire; but with respect to religion, the case is not so clear. We believe, however, that the clause is equally applicable to Ireland as to England. The Church of Ireland is united with that of England; and it would, as we think, be held, that no change could take place in the one which could not be attempted in the other. Undoubtedly Ireland is the place where the first and the fiercest attack will be made on the Anglican Church; and that advantage might be taken of a minority for such a purpose can be doubted by no one who understands the character of the Romish priesthood, and remembers that the laity are entirely subject to their domination. On this point we are nevertheless satisfied, being convinced that the clause in question applies to the Church in Ireland as well as in England.

By another clause in the bill, the Regent would forfeit his powers on marrying a Roman Catholic. This clause was objected to by the Duke of Sussex, who, alluding to the youth of the Regent, thought that in such an affair he ought to be left unfettered. Such may be the views of his Royal Highness; but the people of England would not be satisfied with a measure which would permit the infant Sovereign of these realms to be in any way under the guardianship of a Papist stepmother; and as to any hardship on the Regent, he would only have to relinquish his post, of which he could not fairly complain; for it would be strange indeed if the Regent could marry a Papist while acting as the guardian of his child and invested with sovereign authority, when the Sovereign cannot form any matrimonial alliance except with a Protestant.

On every account, therefore, we view this bill as of the utmost consequence at this particular juncture, because it recognizes those principles to which we are indebted for all our privileges, both civil and religious.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

This question was touched upon in our last; but since that number was published a most important discussion has taken place in the House of Commons. Sir Robert Inglis introduced the subject in a speech of very great ability, containing a vast body of statistical information respecting the spiritual destitution of the country.

It would not be possible for us to allude even to all the subjects so ably handled by Sir Robert Inglis: we can do no more than submit a few remarks on those points which appear to merit the greatest prominence.

In allusion to the alleged numbers of Dissenters, it was proved by the Parliamentary Returns under the new Register Bill, that they are a mere fraction of the community. Various periodicals and newspapers, whose conductors it seems have little reverence for truth, put forth the monstrous assertion that the Dissenters constitute a majority of the community. On such a subject facts are better than arguments. The following facts are highly important, and ought to be circulated in every direction:

The number of Dissenting marriages within a specified period throughout the whole kingdom amounted to 4,088; while the marriages solemnized during the same period according to the rites of the Church of England, in London alone, amounted to 6,032. Thus there were nearly 2,000 more marriages celebrated in the Church of England in London alone than were contracted by Dissenters throughout the whole country, including the metro-

ropolis! This fact proves the falsehood of the Dissenting assertions on this point. Judging from this statement, and its accuracy cannot be disputed, we cannot but come to the conclusion that the Dissenters, so far from constituting a majority of the population of this country, as some *veracious* journals confidently affirm, are not merely a minority, but a miserable minority.

Within the year ending June 30, 1838, the number of marriages according to the rites of the Church of England, amounted to ONE HUNDRED AND SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND ONE; while during the same period all other marriages (those which were performed in licensed chapels, in the superintendent registrar's office, and those of the Jews and Quakers) reached the number only of *four thousand two hundred and eighty!*

These facts are conclusive as to the relative numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters. Our opinion has ever been that the Registration bill, for which so loud a clamour was raised by the Dissenters, was the most unfortunate measure for the Dissenting body which could possibly have been contrived; for by making a separation between Churchmen and Dissenters the strength of the one party and the weakness of the other are rendered so apparent, that no doubt can be entertained on the subject; whereas before the passing of that bill, the Dissenters were able to delude the public, by loud and continual assertions into the belief that their numbers were a majority of the population. Most assuredly no other measure ever so completely exposed their insignificance. The above facts prove also that a great commotion may be raised by bustle and loud talking, or talking without any regard to truth.

Now on these well ascertained facts—facts elicited by the very measure so eagerly sought for by Dissenters—we ground an argument for Church extension. That there are large masses of the people who are left without the means of religious instruction has been most satisfactorily proved. It may be said however that the superabundant population are not members of the Church of England. We ask, are they Dissenters? No one will hazard such an assertion. Of course they are not members of the Church of England, strictly speaking, but as they are not Dissenters, it is the duty of the State to provide the means for their religious instruction. The Church of England is alone able to furnish those means, because that Church alone is supported by the State. All other religious bodies are merely tolerated. The State permits them to act as they please, and to make what efforts they please for the amelioration of the condition of the people; but the State does not patronise them, as is the case with the Anglican Church. As long then as the

Church of England is recognized by the State in that capacity, it is the duty of the Government to provide for the spiritual wants of the community through her instrumentality. We contend, moreover, that those masses of the population which are now destitute of the means of religious worship and instruction would attend the worship of the Anglican Church in preference to any other modes, if the means were furnished for that purpose. It has been proved to a demonstration that the proportion of Dissenters is very inconsiderable; in one county being only *one* to *seventeen*, in another *one* to *sixteen*, and in others *one* to *fourteen* and *fifteen*. It is then most reasonable for the Church to put forth her claims, and to ask the Government to furnish her with the means of instructing the neglected portions of the population. Nor can any valid reason be assigned by Dissenters for leaving them without the means of religious worship and instruction. To refuse to permit churches to be erected in populous districts is to act the part of the dog in the manger; for the Dissenters will not provide the means themselves, and they are not willing for the State, of which they form an inconsiderable portion, to supply the means. They boast of the voluntary principle; but it has been proved to be inefficient. A finer field for its operation was never presented than that which is presented in our populous districts; and yet to this hour it remains uncultivated. This circumstance proves that the voluntary principle is totally inadequate to the demand for instruction. If Voluntaryism is capable of so much, how comes it to pass that so little is accomplished, or even attempted? The answer perhaps may be, that the efforts of Voluntaryism are crippled by the existence of a Church supported by other means. We cannot, however, see the force of such an argument, and at all events the advocates of the Voluntary principle can appeal to no facts as evidence of the correctness of their assertions. They merely make the assertion, but it is too much to expect, in the absence of all proofs on the subject, that it can be received by a discerning public.

It is certain then that large masses of the people have not the means of religious worship and instruction; and it is equally certain, that churches must be erected; for by no other means than those which are supplied by the Anglican Church can the evils be removed. It appears that every town whose inhabitants were above 10,000 has doubled its population during the last forty years. In the time of Queen Anne it was proved that London contained a population of 200,000 who were unprovided with church accommodation. The legislature of that day were shocked at the extent of the evil, and immediately took steps to

remedy it by erecting fifty new churches in the metropolis. At the present moment the destitute population is much greater, notwithstanding the vast number of churches erected within the last few years, and yet the legislature has this year recorded its determination to do nothing.

Lord John Russell pleaded poverty as a reason for opposing the measure, and also that it would be offensive to Dissenters. That such a measure would be offensive to Dissenters there can be no doubt; but is that a valid reason for refusing to confer a boon upon the poor? We imagine not. The poor have a claim upon the State. They have a right to say, provide us churches in which we may worship God and listen to the preaching of the Gospel. If Lord John Russell were to refuse his support to every measure which is distasteful to some small body in the country, no bill could ever receive his sanction.

The motion of Sir Robert Inglis was negatived by a majority of *nineteen* only, 149 voting for, and 168 against it. Had the Conservatives been at their posts, the measure must have been carried. These are not times for members to be absent when great public questions are agitated. It was owing therefore to Conservative negligence, not to Ministerial influence, that the measure was lost. The division, however, must be a sore disappointment to the Radicals and Dissenters. They must perceive that the Conservatives will be encouraged to persevere in their efforts, and that another session is not likely to pass away without the adoption of some measure for Church extension.

Whenever this subject is introduced into the House of Commons, the whole tribe of Radical, Popish, and Dissenting orators exhaust their eloquence in expatiating on the wealth of the clergy, upon whom they would impose the burden of affording additional churches for our destitute population. Again and again has it been proved, by documentary evidence of the most undoubted kind, that the income of the clergy averages only a little more than 280*l.* per annum to each. What then could be done by the clergy to meet the demand for new churches?

THE DEAN AND CHAPTER OF EXETER.

Our readers are aware that a dispute has for some time existed between the crown and the chapter relative to the election to the office of dean of the cathedral. One gentleman was nominated by the crown; but the chapter elected another. A *mandamus* was applied for to compel the chapter to elect the crown nominee. Lord Denman, however, has decided that the crown had no such right as had been claimed; and the appointment by the chapter was accordingly confirmed. Some of the

Ministerial papers lamented the decision. They appear to have cared nothing for the right, but to have wished to give the power to the crown, whether right or wrong. We should not have noticed this question, except for the purpose of directing attention to the calumnies and misrepresentations which were poured forth day after day against the chapter, and against the Bishop as their advocate in the House of Lords. The decision in the Court of Queen's Bench has proved that the Bishop of Exeter was correct in all his statements, though they were so cavilled at by the Ministerial scribes.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL DUTIES AND REVENUES BILL.

This is one of the most important measures of the session. In using this language we do not mean to intimate an approval or disapproval of the bill, for we feel considerable difficulty on the subject; so great indeed are our difficulties that we shall abstain from giving a positive opinion on the bill. Our readers will see the reasonableness of such a feeling, when they bear in mind that the measure was supported by the Metropolitan and the Bishop of London, and opposed by the Bishops of Exeter and Winchester, and by several other prelates of distinguished reputation. All these prelates are the warmest friends of the Anglican Church. Not one of them would perform a single act which, in his judgment, was calculated to injure the Church. Under such circumstances, therefore, it would be unbecoming in us to express a positive opinion on the subject. The measure is now become a law, and we sincerely hope that the results may be beneficial to the Church.

But though we shall abstain from giving a positive opinion on this important question, our readers have a right to expect, in a work like ours, that the measure should not be passed over in silence.

Two most important and interesting debates took place during the progress of the bill through the House of Lords; the one on the 27th of July, on the second reading, which was carried by a majority of fifty-one, and the other on the 30th of July, when the bill went into committee. All the arguments which could be adduced in favour of or against the bill were used on these occasions. Since the debate, a correspondence which took place some years ago between the Bishop of Exeter, and his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir Robert Peel, has been published. From that correspondence, it is clear that the plan which is embodied in the bill originated with Sir Robert Peel. A private letter from that eminent statesman, dated December 22, 1834, and addressed to the Bishop of Exeter,

contains sentiments so creditable to the writer and so decisive on the question of his affection for the Church, that we feel constrained to submit an extract to our readers, and especially as there are some Churchmen who express themselves doubtfully and despondingly respecting Sir Robert's views on Church questions in general :—

“I solemnly declare my main object is to promote the true interests of the Church of England. I will most willingly return to private life, and make the very, very small sacrifice of office, rather than consent to anything which I conscientiously believe to be prejudicial to the great and sacred objects for which the Church was established ; but my earnest advice is, that the Church should avail itself of this, possibly the last opportunity of aiding its true friends in the cause of judicious reform, by enabling us to go all the lengths we can go with perfect safety, and to make, if possible, a satisfactory and final settlement.

“I should be most happy to hear from you on this great point, to which I am confident your attention must have been anxiously directed. I need hardly assure you that all mere political considerations, all views of Church preferment, as being subservient to party interests, are as nothing in my mind compared with the great objects of giving real stability to the Church in its spiritual character ; and that I believe enlarged political interests will be best promoted by strengthening the hold of the Church of England upon the love and veneration of the community.”

These sentiments were expressed in a private letter. They are now for the first time made public, and they ought to endear the writer to every Churchman. Such sentiments could not proceed from a Whig minister or a Whig statesman.

We confess that we look with suspicion, in this changing and innovating age, on all changes in our time-honoured institutions ; and were it possible for us to have decided the question, we should certainly have rejected the bill, and have left the cathedrals in the state in which they have so long existed ; but when we find the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London supporting the measure ; and when moreover we learn that it has been sanctioned by Sir Robert Peel and by the Duke of Wellington, we are inclined to suspect our own judgment, and to conclude that we may be in error in our views. Assuredly, if we had a choice, we should have wished not to diminish the numbers in our cathedrals, but to have rendered them more efficient, by enabling the members to fulfil those duties which were originally intended. . On this point our views coincide with those so well expressed by Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, in a debate on this same subject. Mr. Gladstone argued that the chapter took a part in the election of the Bishop, and that the occasion might arise when it might

be necessary to interpose its authority to prevent any gross abuse of the power of the crown. Mr. Gladstone also stated that the chapter was the Bishop's council. Such was the case originally, when chapters were instituted; and they are recognized in that capacity, or something like it, in some of the canons of the Anglican Church, as well as by certain acts of Parliament of the period of the Reformation. For many years the chapters have ceased to act in that character; but surely this circumstance affords no valid reason against the restoration of their original powers. "Formerly (observes Mr. Gladstone) the chapter assisted the Bishop as his council in conferring ordination, and also in giving effect to a sentence of deprivation; and they were bound by the canons of the Church to aid him in those important functions. He was quite sure that the isolated position of the Bishops worked most unfavourably for the Church and the people, and that it still formed one of the main causes which kept us separate from those Protestant brethren from whom we were so unfortunately divided. We might, in this particular, take a lesson from those who had long known how to guide their Church policy. The Church of Rome in England was about to reorganize those institutions which it was the object of this bill to reform by cutting down. The influence of the Bishops of the Church of England was too small because their power was too large, and that power was alien to the spirit of the present time, as well as to the practice of the primitive Church. He thought, therefore, that it might be worth while to consider whether it would not be important to restore to the chapters those functions which they had formerly exercised as council to the Bishop."

Nothing, in our opinion, could be more calculated for the welfare of the Church than the adoption of such a plan as that recommended by Mr. Gladstone. Still we cannot concur, for the reasons already stated, with those who denounce the present measure as destructive to the best interests of the Anglican Church. The characters of some of the supporters of the measure is a sufficient guarantee, that they view it as calculated to strengthen the interests of the Church. It was on occasion of the debate on this bill, on the thirtieth of July, that the Duke of Wellington delivered a speech, which, like the letter of Sir Robert Peel, ought to endear his Grace to all lovers of the Church of England.

"I have listened (said his Grace) to the debates which have been going on for the last two or three nights, and indeed I may say for many nights before, on this important subject, and it appears to me that there is no difference of opinion amongst us on these points, namely—

that means must be found of preaching the word of God to the people of England; and I go further, for this point also is not disputed—that those means must proceed, in the first instance, from the Church. In providing those means you will not only be performing a duty incumbent on you, but you will also be following the example of every other nation in the world. It has been my lot to live among idolaters, among persons of all creeds and of all religions, but I never knew of a single instance in which public means were not provided to teach the people the religion of their country. There might be false religions; I know but of one true one, but yet means were never wanting to teach those false religions, and I hope that we shall not have done with this subject until we have found out sufficient means for teaching the people of England their duty to their Maker, and their duty to one another, founded on their duty to that Maker.”

Such sentiments are worthy of the man by whom they were uttered. Every word spoken by the Duke of Wellington is listened to with the most profound attention by all parties; and we are very much mistaken if the speech from which the preceding extract is taken has not already produced an impression on the country, the effects of which will be visible in the debates of the next session.

Counsel were heard in the House of Lords against the bill: and one circumstance was stated by Mr. B. Knight at which we were somewhat startled. He asserted that all the enemies of the Church were in favour of this bill. We believe that the statement is correct: consequently they do not view the measure as calculated to strengthen the Church, or they would not have supported it. At the same time they may be mistaken in their calculations: and as a *set-off* against the expectations of the Radicals, Papists, and Dissenters, we have the expressed declarations of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and those of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, that the measure, in their estimation, will prove not only safe, but highly beneficial and conservative of the best interests of the Church of England.

By the bill in question a certain number of canonries will be abolished as they become vacant, the incomes of which will constitute a fund, to be applied to Church objects in those parts of the country in which the spiritual destitution is the greatest. It seems to have been the opinion of the Duke of Wellington, that Parliament would not make a grant of public money until the Church had made some attempt, by another distribution of some of her revenues. In his Grace's estimation, therefore, the measure is auxiliary to other measures for Church extension, or rather their precursor. Besides the resources for that purpose which may be available from this quarter, we may fairly expect

that others will be created by a Parliamentary grant. Nor is it at all improbable that the result may be such as we have suggested. It is evidently anticipated by the noble duke ; for, after stating that the means of providing for the spiritual wants of the people must proceed, in the first instance, from the Church, he adds, "and that they must be exhausted before the public was called on for other means." None of the enemies of the Church can allege that the incomes of the parochial clergy are too great ; consequently the only available resources from the Church must be derived from the bishoprics and the cathedrals. By the present bill, therefore, and the arrangements previously made respecting bishopricks, all that the Church can do has been done. We may, therefore, now expect that something will be done by the State.

There are other questions, of no small importance, which we must reluctantly leave until our next Report. We allude especially to the state of Religion and the Church in the Colonies, and the subject of Education at home. In our next number these matters shall not be overlooked.

General Literature.

Unitarianism tried by Scripture and Experience : a Compilation of Treatises and Testimonies in Support of Trinitarian Doctrine and Evangelical Principles, with a General Introduction. By a LAYMAN. London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1840.

AN answer to the question, Why are you not a Socinian ? by the late Rev. Joseph Freeston—Joseph John Gurney on the Trinity, on Sin original and actual, on the Deity of Christ, on Redemption—A Narrative of the renunciation of Unitarian and the adoption of Trinitarian sentiments, by the late J. E. Slack, M.D., of Bristol—The essential passages of a letter addressed by the Rev. P. E. Butler, B.A., to the Unitarians of Ipswich, on the occasion of the Rev. Joseph Ketley's renunciation of Unitarianism—A Letter on the Atonement of Christ, and the expiatory nature of his sufferings, by W. T. Blair, Esq.—Mrs. Hemans' dying testimony to the inestimable value and supporting efficacy of the atonement—Extracts from a Letter addressed by the Rev. Charles Leslie, M.A. to a Deist—Letter by the Chancellor D'Aguesseau on Christian Mysteries—Lord Bacon's Theological Creed. Such are the contents (of which there ought to be an index in the volume) of this compilation. They speak for themselves, and all that is necessary for us to add is,

that there is a very useful, sound, and well written conclusion by the compiler.

A Numismatic Manual. By JOHN YONGE ACKERMAN, F.S.A.
London: Taylor and Walton. 1840.

WE have long looked for a work on Numismatics which might give so much information as every well-educated man *ought* to possess, be free from vulgar errors, and at the same time be within the reach of the general reader. Just such a book has Mr. Ackerman given us; and in order to show the unskilled in Numismatology the interest as well as the importance of the subject, we must beg them to follow us in a few brief remarks on this admirable "manual." It is divided into five parts: the first treating of the Greek coins of cities and princes; the second of Roman coins; the third of Anglo-Saxon and English; the fourth of Anglo-Gallic; and the fifth of Irish and Scotch coins. We shall pass over the first section very briefly, only remarking that the beautiful medal of Camarina, which serves as a vignette to the title page, does evidently, as Mr. Ackerman observes, represent the *lake personified*, and not Venus or Leda—a female figure of the most exquisite proportions is seen floating over the waves, reposing on the back of a swan, whose wings are raised on each side to render her seat secure, and whose neck she clasps with one arm. With the other she holds the end of her robe, which, filled with the light winds, swells into graceful folds beyond the swan's neck. A dolphin attends the lovely divinity; the legend is simply KAMAPINA. A little reflection will prove that this cannot be *Leda*.

We pass on to the Roman series, of which there is a sufficiently ample account. The gradual improvement in the medalliac art from the times of the triumvirate to the reign of Hadrian is noticed, and its declension from that period. But the æra of Diocletian was an epoch in its history; and we find not only that the silver coinage, which had gradually degenerated into bad billon, and from bad billon to washed copper, was restored to its former standard, but the second brass was again struck, though somewhat thinner than the first 20 Emperors. Nor were these the only improvements: the imperial series, which from Valerian to Diocletian (including, together with empresses and usurpers, coins of no fewer than thirty persons) is miserably defective in execution as well as base in quality, was raised by the last-named prince, not only to purity of metal, but to neatness of workmanship. We look, however, in vain, for those bold outlines, those highly-raised figures, which adorn the coinage of a better period; a tame neatness is the unvarying

substitute. There are a few beautiful coins among the small brass of Constantine; but after his reign the Roman mint does as little credit to the age as our mint does to the nineteenth century. We must express our wonder at an error, which is probably after all one of the printer, and not chargeable on Mr. Ackerman. He states that the third brass of Carausius are rare (R. 1 to 8). Now they are common to excess; few coins are more so; they may be positively purchased by the bushel for two-pence or three-pence each. But the coinage of this imperial pirate will receive more general attention shortly, as Mr. C. R. Smith is engaged in preparing a work on the subject.

The third part of the "Numismatic Manual" treats of British, Saxon, and English coins; and on this part we must say a few words, to express our admiration at the way in which Mr. Ackerman has compressed into a small space so large a quantity of information. The English coins are interesting not only historically, but from the beauty of their scriptural legends. The groats and half-groats, from their origin in the reign of Edward I. or III., bore the words *POSUI DEUM ADIVTOREM MEVM* (I have placed my trust in God); a fit motto for the victorious Plantagenets, and which we find with pleasure continued to the reign of Elizabeth. When James I., on his accession, united the kingdoms of England and Scotland, he signalized the event by striking shillings and sixpences with the significant legend, *QVÆ DEVS CONIVNXIT. NEMO SEPARET*; and when the gunpowder plot was discovered and baffled, he adopted the equally significant one *EXURGAT. DEVS. DISSIPENTUR INIMICI*. Another coin of James, bearing reference to the fact that, as Henry VII. had united the rival roses of York and Lancaster, so *he* had united the rival kingdoms of England and Scotland, has the legend *HENRICUS ROSAS REGNA JACOBUS*. The coins of his unfortunate successor are highly interesting: the larger silver has *CHRISTO AVSPICE REGNO*, and the smaller ones *IUSTITIA THRONVM FIRMAT*. The pennies, which from the earliest times down to Edward I. bear the names of the minter and the place of coining, and from Edward I. to Henry VII. the place only, as *CIVITAS LONDON. CIVITAS. CANTOR.*, bear, from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of Charles I., the singular legend, *H OR E OR M., OR P. ET. M. OR J. OR C.D.G. ROSA SINE SPINA.*; referring, in the case of Henry VIII., to the union with the Yorkist and Lancastrian roses, whereby the *thorns*, that is rivals, were removed. The base silver of Edward VI. bears the text, *TIMOR DOMINI FONS VITÆ*, and during the reigns of that prince and his father the coinage was in a deplorable condition. An amusing anecdote is told of Bishop Latimer, who referred to

the base shilling in a sermon preached before the king; this gave great offence, and he was charged with disloyalty :—

“ We have now,” says he, “ a very pretty little shylling indede, a very pretty one. I have but one I thynke in my purse, and the last day I had put it away almost for an old groat, and so I trust some will take them. The fineness of the silver I cannot see, but therein is written a fine sentence, that is TIMOR, &c. I would this sentence were always printed in the heart of the king in choosing his wife, and in all his officers.”

The accusation of disloyalty he repelled in another sermon, delivered at the end of the month. The style is, as Mr. Ackerman justly observes, so singular and characteristic, that we cannot pass it without a quotation :—

“ Thus they burdened me ever with sedition, and wot ye what ? I chaunced, in my last sermon, to speak a merry word of the new shilling to refresh my auditory, how I was like to have put away my new shilling for an old groat. I was herein noted to speak seditiously; yet I can comfort myself in one thing, that I am not alone, and that I have a fellow—a companion of sedition—and wot ye who is my fellow ? Esay the prophet. I spake but of a little pretty shilling, but he speaketh to Jerusalem after another sort, and was so bold as to meddle with their coin : ‘ Thou proude, thou covetous, thou hautie city of Jerusalem—Argentum tuum versum est in scoriā—thy silver is turned into—what ? Into testoons ? *In scoriā*. Into dross.’ Ah, seditious wretch ! what had he to do with the mint ? Why should he not have left that matter to some master of policie to reprove ?”—p. 283.

The coinage of the commonwealth (which bore on one side, the obverse, THE COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND. round a shield charged with St. George’s Cross, and on the reverse GOD. WITH VS. round two shields, one as on the obverse, and the other charged with the Irish harp) gave rise to the remark, no less witty than true, that God and the Commonwealth were on different sides. Nor are the legends of the gold coins less interesting: the first coin struck *for circulation* in that metal among us has the pious legend DOMINE. NE. IN. FURORE. TVO. ARGVAS. ME.; this coin is the florin. The noble bears the singular legend, I.H.S. AUTEM. TRANSIENS. PER MEDIUM. ILLORUM IBAT. On the coins of succeeding monarchs we find the following texts, or religious legends: PER CRUCEM TUAM SALVA NOS XTE. REDEMPTOR—LUCERNA. PEDIBUS MEIS. VERBVM. TUUM—INIMICOS. EIVS. INDUAM. CONFUSIONE—SCUTUM. FIDEI. PROTEGIT EVM—A. DOMINO. FACTUM. EST. ISTUD. ET. EST. MIRABILE. IN OCULIS. NOSTRIS. Then again by James I., FACIAM. EOS. IN GENTEM. UNAM—by Charles I., FLORENT CONCORDIA REGNA; and AMOR POPULI PRÆSIDIUM REGIS, and the more just and

pious sentiment CULTORES SUI DEUS PROTEGIT; but we might go on for many pages, were we only to give the interesting legends of the English coin. We pass to the copper coinage just to notice the St. Patrick's halfpenny and farthing; the former of which is extremely rare: they were struck by the Irish Papists, to commemorate the massacre of 1641, and bear on the obverse the hypocritical legend, FLOREAT REX., and on the halfpenny the equally hypocritical one, ECCE GREX, while the farthing has the legend, marked by a still more disgusting affectation, QUIESCAT. PLEBS. This almost reminds us of the American medal of Franklin, which has the following truly blasphemous inscription, on the reverse, ERIPUIT. FULMEN. CÆLO. SCEPTRUMQUE. TYRANNIS. We conclude with remarking that the value of the farthing of Queen Anne (that of 1714) is about five shillings. Mr. Ackerman's work is both valuable and seasonable: we wish it, what we are quite sure it will meet with, a ready and extensive sale.

The English Mother; or, Early Lessons on the Church of England.
By a LADY. London: Burns. 1840.

WE have met with many attempts to instil into the youthful mind correct ideas concerning that branch of Christ's Catholic Church of which we rejoice in being members, and but few of these attempts are altogether successful. Some err in one respect, some in another; and however uncourteous it may seem to say so, we really wish that ladies would find other employment than theological writing. In the little book before us we have, it is true, much that is very good; but there is, not a mere confusion between the visible and invisible Church, but an assertion that they are both one. The author supposes that the *visible* Church consists of *all* sincere Christians; an error which we never remember to have met with before.

A Hand-book for the Churches; or, an Argument in a Nutshell about the Things of the Church, addressed to the Children of the Kingdom.
By a LABOURER FOR PEACE. Edinburgh: Printing and Publishing Co. 1840.

THE Author of the "Handbook for the Churches" is a man of Christian feeling, but of very little knowledge of Christian antiquities. He affords a proof that it is very easy, with a *small degree* of information, to close up questions in a nutshell; but a little larger degree will show that the question in point is too expansive for the nutshells of such reasoners.

Selections from Robert Hall, A.M., with a Sketch of his Life ; together with Notes and Illustrations, Literary and Theological. By CHARLES BADHAM, B.A., Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. London : Ball, Arnold and Co.

THESE Selections are a gathering of the richest morceaux from the works of the well known Robert Hall upon a great variety of subjects, which are indicated to the reader by appropriate titles placed at their head. It has been remarked, that to represent an author by detached passages picked out of his writings is to act the part of the simpleton in Hierocles, who having a house to dispose of, carried about with him one of the bricks as a sample of it. This observation will not apply in the present instance. Every detached piece is complete in itself, and fairly exhibits the choicest thoughts of the writer upon the subject under consideration. And manifold indeed, and important, are the topics which are treated of in the volume: here is intellectual food for the scholar, the philosopher, the statesman, and the divine; matter which relates to the inward and outward condition of mankind, to various dispositions and states of the mind, and to the different circumstances of life—matter which must be of unfailing interest to us as intellectual and social beings, and as those who are destined to exist when the eye shall no longer see nor the hands handle the works of our fellow-mortals; matter which must be of concern to us, as connected not only with our present life-span, but with all eternity. And all this treated in the superior manner, and expressed in the surpassing language of Robert Hall.

Moreover, the selector has here and there inserted in foot-notes, and brought, as it were side by side, the reflections of other master-minds upon the same subjects: hence we are ever and anon enchanted with the “thoughts that breathe and words that burn” of such powerful thinkers and writers as Burke, Coleridge, and Johnson, among the departed; and Brougham, Macauley, and Southey, among the living. Nor are the extracts confined to Mr. Hall’s observations on *things*; they also extend to *persons*—to those who have won the world’s admiration by their genius, its regard by their virtues, and its gratitude by their usefulness; men who have either shone like stars or blazed like meteors; who have blessed the world by their benign influence, or deterred by the wholesome warning of their example. Such being the case, it must at once be apparent, that the individual who has undertaken the task of culling these “Selections,” and presenting them to the public eye and public use in a convenient form, has rendered good service both to his author and to his countrymen;—to his author, by making his

works more generally known, and therefore more generally admired and profitable: he has thus contributed to the wider spread of his well-earned fame, and to the object which was the principal one in the author's view and the dearest to his heart, namely, the bettering of the moral condition of his species. And if it should be said that these Selections are but sips of the author's living water, let it be remembered that they will have achieved a most desirable end, if they should instigate any one who may taste them to imbibe the copious draughts which may be drawn from the well-spring of the entire works.

To his countrymen, the compiler has performed no little good, by placing within the reach of numbers the sentiments of a highly-gifted and good-seeking man on so great a variety of topics; some of vital importance, all of more or less interest. And with respect to the volume before us we may confidently assert, that he who should give it a place on his table, to take it up now and then only for a few minutes, will not fail of satisfaction, on whatever page his eye may chance to rest; and that his mind is little to be envied, if from the more frequent, though temporary perusal of it, he do not find himself a more accomplished, a wiser, and a better man.

The type and the general appearance of the volume is all that the most fastidious person could desire; which is saying a great deal in the year 1840.

The Life of Luther, with Notices and Extracts of his Popular Writings, Translated from the German of Gustavus Pfeizer. By. T. S. WILLIAMS, Johannæum College, Hamburgh. With an Introductory Essay by the Author of "The Natural History of Enthusiasm."
London: Society for the Promotion of Popular Instruction. 1840.

OF Pfeizer's "Life of Luther" we can only say that we are glad to see it in English. With regard to the Society from which the present translation emanates, we shall suspend our opinion. And as to the introductory essay, our sole observation shall be, that were Mr. Isaac Taylor as well endowed with candour as he is with acuteness, he would be a most valuable as well as a most able writer.

A Digest of Hooker's Treatise on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. By the Rev. J. B. SMITH, D.D. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

A VERY able digest, and one for which students will have to thank Dr. Smith, is this which is now lying before us. We have examined it with attention, and can recommend it. In the present day the arguments of the "judicious" presbyter cannot be too widely circulated.

Propædia Prophetica ; a View of the Use and Design of the Old Testament. Followed by Two Dissertations : I. On the Causes of the Rapid Propagation of the Gospel among the Heathen ; and II. On the Credibility of the Facts related in the New Testament. By WILLIAM ROWE LYALL, M.A., Archdeacon of Colchester, Co-dean of Bocking, and Rector of Hadleigh, Suffolk. London : Rivingtons.

AN original work—one which is likely to live and maintain its rank, and which, both by the beauty of its style and the value of its contents, deserves to be read over and over again—is a rare occurrence. Such a work we have however before us. The *Propædia Prophetica* is the substance of fifteen sermons, delivered by Archdeacon Lyall, as Warburtonian lecturer in the chapel of Lincoln's Inn. The leading idea seems to have suggested itself to the mind of the learned author in consequence of a deficiency in Paley. The "Evidences" of that great man are perfectly satisfactory, so far as they go ; but he proves his propositions independently of the event ; they are proved to be true, even if the designs of the apostles had miscarried, and Christianity itself turned out a failure. Now it is obvious that the *establishment* of the religion is necessary to prove its divine origin, and since this fact cannot be questioned, Paley has contented himself with adducing it as a proof of that divine origin. Still the former part of Paley's proposition would be true without the latter ; and the proof therefore is in so far incomplete, as it would be quite true even if the religion were proved by failure to be not divine.

Now the point the Archdeacon has taken up is to show that the success of Christianity was, in the very nature of things, unavoidable ; that were it to occur again, or had it occurred at any other period, the results must *necessarily* be the same ; thus supplying the only link wanting in Paley's chain of argument. The whole work is a most luminous display of evidence derived from prophecy, and is no less clear in its style than convincing in its reasoning.

Lectures on Ancient Israel and the Israelitish Origin of the Modern Nations of Europe. By J. WILSON. Cheltenham : Mimpriss. 1840.

THE object of these lectures is to show that all the nations of modern Europe derive their origin from the children of Israel ; an attempt which, though made with much learning, is we think far from successful. There are many parts of the book with which we are much pleased, and shall be glad to meet with Mr. Wilson when engaged in some less romantic undertaking.

History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, in Germany, Switzerland, &c. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, President of the Theological School of Geneva, and Member of the Société Evangelique. Vols. I. and II. London: Walker. 1840.

THIS work, which it is impossible to describe fully, or even accurately to characterize, in so short a space as we can devote to it at present, is undoubtedly an acquisition to the student. That the facts recorded are true, and that the whole work bears tokens of being written by a man of sterling piety, is not however sufficient to make it in *all* respects a safe guide. The theology of Geneva and the ideas of Church government which subsist still among the members of that communion, are neither, as we conceive, true nor apostolical. The results to which they have led in the lamentable perversion of doctrine, not only in Geneva herself but also in her dependencies, are enough to prove this. But while we, therefore, object to many of M. Merle d'Aubigné's views and reasonings, we set a high value upon his work, which we are glad to see so well translated. The conflict between Luther on the one hand, and Tetzell and his myrmidons on the other, is most graphically described; and not the least merit of this valuable work is, that we are made so intimately acquainted with the great German Reformer. Were it not that we purpose, when this edition of the translation is completed, to return to the subject again, and to treat of the Reformation, both in Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, we should extend our remarks to a greater length here. "The History of the *Reformation* (observes M. d'Aubigné) is altogether distinct from the History of *Protestantism*. In the former, all bears the character of a regeneration of human nature, a religious and social transformation, emanating from God himself: in the latter, we see too often a glaring depravation of first principles, the conflict of *parties*, a sectarian spirit, and the operation of private interests. The History of Protestantism might claim the attention only of *Protestants*; the History of the Reformation is a book for all *Christians*, or rather, for all mankind."

The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark Paraphrased, and put into Questions and Answers, on a New Plan; intended for the Use of Parents and Teachers. By the Rev. JOHN ROGERSON COTTER, M.A., Rector of Innishannon. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

THE title of this useful but unassuming little work fully explains its nature. It has now reached a second edition; a distinction which it well merits. It is admirably adapted for infant schools, and might be advantageously substituted for some manuals now in use in such institutions.

VOL. VIII.—K K

Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts. By the Author of "The Natural History of Enthusiasm." London: Jackson and Walford. 1840. Part V.

WHEN we heard that the present number of this work was intended to contain a reply to objectors, we confess that we had little expectation of finding any reply to the exposé of error and unfairness which we made of the four previous numbers in our publication for April. We treated Mr. Taylor with courtesy, while we exposed his errors and unmasked his misrepresentations. We were perfectly well aware, that as we stated *facts* our objections to Mr. Taylor's work were unanswerable; we therefore repeat we did not expect any reply. While, however, we feel deeply grieved at the glaring falsehood which makes the staple of No. 5, we are somewhat amused at its cool impudence. Mr. Taylor positively takes up a whole number to restate the question, and to *answer objections*; and his sole answer is, that he has met with no *argument* against him, but merely *virulence*. We shall when the work is finished devote another article to it, which, should the author again condescend to *answer objections*, he will perhaps do well to treat in the same way as he has done the last.

Englishman's Library, Vol. XI.—A Practical Discourse on Religious Assemblies. By WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, Master of the Temple, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty. A New Edition, with a Preface by the Rev. HENRY MELVILL, B.D., Minister of Camden Chapel, and Chaplain to the Tower of London. London: Burns. 1840.

THE Englishman's Library is proceeding very satisfactorily: the excellence of Dr. Sherlock's work is too universally acknowledged to need any remark of ours, and we highly approve the selection of it to form a volume of this useful series. Mr. Melvill's preface is, as might have been expected from him, sound, practical, and beautifully written. We may observe too that the typography of the series improves: the present volume is the best in this respect. Would that the lessons which it teaches were attended to in this age of carelessness and self-communication.

Moral Contrast. A Tale. By F. BOLINGBROKE RIBBANS, F.S.A. London: Longmans. 1840.

IF our advice could at all avail with this unfortunate gentleman, he would abandon what is with him a "cacoethes scribendi," and substitute for it an "agathoethes legendi."

The Siege of Lichfield; a Tale illustrative of the Great Rebellion.
By the Rev. W. GRESLEY, M.A. London: Burns. 1840.

FOR a third time has Mr. Gresley stepped forward to enlist the story-loving propensities of our age in the service of

“Faith, and of devotion true,
Well-judging, and sincere;”

and a right able labourer in the cause is he. The “Siege of Lichfield” is better either than “Clement Walton” or the “English Churchman,” so far as the narrative is concerned; while the principles it maintains are as sound. The excellent author constructs his plots upon the simplest possible model; but the dialogue is good, the descriptions picturesque, and there is an air of verisimilitude running through the whole.

The Churchman's Brief Manual of Baptism, in Four Parts. By the Rev. CHARLES E. KENNAWAY, A.M., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Incumbent of Christ Church, Cheltenham, and Vicar of Campden. London: Nisbet. 1840.

IN this seasonable work Mr. Kennaway speaks first of the mode in which, and secondly of the time at which, Baptism should be administered: he speaks, thirdly, of the effects of Baptism; and lastly, treats most satisfactorily upon Baptismal regeneration. That Baptism secures to the recipient a forgiveness of sins, is asserted by our Church—but what forgiveness? We reply, the forgiveness of *original* sin. Such is the view taken by Mr. Kennaway. He speaks too, not only to the reason, but also to the prejudices of men; for he quotes the venerable Simeon, to show those who ignorantly call themselves his followers, and “*evangelicals*,” how *orthodox* upon this important point was that excellent man.

1. *Universal Redemption Considered.* By the Author of “Parental Responsibility.” London: Ball and Arnold. 1840.
2. *A Letter to the Author of “Universal Redemption Considered.”* By A CLERGYMAN of the Diocese of Cloyne. London: Ball and Arnold. 1840.

THE subject of Universal Redemption is one upon which we think the teaching of the Church is plain enough, nor does it require any new ones to be added to the many scores of volumes already written on the subject. To those however who prefer new books to old ones, which is very far from being our case, we can say that both these works are written in a gentle and Christian spirit.

К К 2

The Mineralogy and Botany of the Bible. By E. C. ROSENMÜLLER, D.D. Translated from the German by T. G. Repp, and the Rev. N. Morren. Edinburgh: Clarke. 1840.

ONE of the most important and interesting works of modern times is Dr. Rosenmüller's Natural History of the Bible. The learning which he has brought to bear upon his favourite study is immense; and he has done what few men so ponderously learned have done before him, has made his great work both intelligible and acceptable to the general reader. The volume before us, though part of a series, is complete in itself; and embraces two sections of that great work of Dr. Rosenmüller, "Biblical Natural History." The translation is well executed; and we hope to see the whole of the learned German's labours given to us in the same form, and with the same success. We know of few more valuable accessions to the student's library than this would be.

The Reasons of a Romanist considered. A Letter to the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, &c. &c. &c. By the Rev. G. B. SANDFORD, M.A., of Brazenose College, Oxford. Oxford: Parker. 1840.

MR. Spencer's Reasons for his conversion are handled in a very gentle and temperate manner by Mr. Sandford, and are shown to weigh very little. The curate of Prestwich has his subject thoroughly "at his fingers' ends," and the perverted Honourable and Reverend makes a very poor figure in his hands.

A Dissertation on the Discourse delivered by our Blessed Saviour in Answer to the Questions of his Apostles, touching the Destruction of the Temple and the End of the World. By the Rev. JOHN STONARD, D.D., Rector of Aldingham, Lancashire. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

A VERY able and interesting dissertation on a very little investigated part of God's word. It takes up the character of our Lord as a prophet, and enlarges upon the meaning of that awful and momentous prophecy which he was pleased to deliver to his disciples.

Religion in connexion with a National System of Instruction; their Union advocated; the Arguments of the Non-religionists considered; and a System proposed. By W. M. GUNN, Rector of Burgh Schools, Haddington. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1840.

MR. Gunn's volume is one that deserves and will receive much attention. His experience entitles him to speak; and though he is wandering far out of the way when he comes to talk about what he calls "sects," still his book is calculated to arouse the attention of the "liberal."

Parliamentary Speeches. Session 1840. London: Painter.

AMONG the most successful expedients for spreading and advancing Conservative principles we may reckon Mr. Painter's "Speeches." They make a very handsome volume, and acquire a very official appearance from the royal arms stamped on the cover; but what we have to say concerns rather the inside of the book than the outside—as Antony Lumpkin, Esq. observed of a letter, that "the inside was usually the cream of the correspondence." Surely the opinions expressed in the eloquent language of a Graham, a Stanley, a Peel, an Inglis, a Herries, a Goulburn—together with a report of questions which made even Hume and Leader Conservatives—the speeches of the Bishops of London, Exeter, Lincoln, Salisbury, Gloucester, Rochester and Winchester, and the Archbishop of Canterbury—all these, and such are the contents of the present volume, must make a record of practical wisdom worthy to descend to posterity.

We confess we look forward with hope to having a better character in the days of our grand-children than we shall have any title to. They will refer to the Conservative speeches as specimens of the House of Commons in 1840; while the trash uttered by Radicals, and Whig-radicals, and Revolutionists, by Papists, and Dissenters, and Infidels, will have passed through every species of decomposition. These speeches, which were printed so that they might be sent through the post, are now collected together, and for eight shillings the reader may possess himself of the "collected wisdom" of a session. The introduction is one of the ablest pieces of political writing we have ever read. It prepares the mind to meet with successive instances of Whig folly and Conservative triumph; and exposes, in a most masterly way, the hollow pretensions of those who, first to obtain place, and then to secure it, sacrificed their own character as English gentlemen, and the welfare of the English nation. The people are at length tired; Radical misrule cannot hold out much longer; and when the curtain shall drop upon the most disgusting farce the political world has ever beheld, then may Mr. Painter take credit to himself, for having, by this spirited undertaking—"The Conservative Speeches," hastened the much to be wished for catastrophe.

Practical Piety; or the Influence of the Religion of the Heart on the Conduct of the Life. By HANNAH MORE. London: Cadell. 1840.

A VERY neat edition of a very useful book; quite a favourable specimen of the manner in which books of the kind are now sent forth to the public. Of course it would be idle to criticise Hannah More's "Practical Piety."

Christian Morals. By the Rev. WILLIAM SEWELL, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. London: Burns. 1840.

ON a work so important as this we would willingly say much; but our limits, as they will prevent us from doing justice to Mr. Sewell, will also prevent our attempting any analysis of his treatise. We shall give in his own words, therefore, the propositions he has endeavoured to prove. We do not agree with all that he advances, though we are bound to acknowledge that he advances nothing that he has not well considered. His propositions are:—

- "1. That Ethics are the science of education.
- "2. That books and writing, without oral instructors, are a very imperfect mode of teaching.
- "3. That external historical testimony of God's revealed will is the only true basis of moral science.
- "4. That the Catholic Church only has the right or the power to educate.
- "5. That Ethics and Christianity, though necessarily connected, must yet be kept distinct.
- "6. That we must avoid rationalism, syncretism, and eclecticism.
- "7. That in education forms are of the greatest importance.
- "8. That the sacraments cannot be separated from ethical education.
- "9. That there is a real personal evil agent to be overcome by those who would be good.
- "10. That goodness consists in obedience; and the Christian's goodness, in obedience to Christ.
- "11. That this obedience is a struggle against temptation.
- "12. That the struggle of a baptized Christian is different from that of a heathen; the former struggling to *retain*, the latter to *attain*, a blessing.
- "13. That our real goodness is the Spirit of God, given at baptism.
- "14. That that which is good produces unity in plurality.
- "15. That in us it is the power of resisting temptation.
- "16. That duties depend on relations, and ultimately on our relations to God.
- "17. That this relation is a covenant.
- "18. That we are dealt with as free agents.
- "19. That the knowledge of God contained in a creed is the first foundation of all goodness.
- "20. That the will of God is our only law.
- "21. That our great object should be to confirm and preserve the blessings given us in baptism.
- "22. That happiness is not pleasure, but prior and superior thereto."

Some of these propositions may not be very intelligible as thus enunciated; but when explained by Mr. Sewell we find them, whether we agree with them all or not, to be the result of deep thinking.

The True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England. By ANDREW SALL, D. D. A new Edition; by the Rev. J. ALLPORT, Minister of St. James, Birmingham. London: Whitaker. 1840.

THIS volume is one among the many proofs now abounding, and of which every day is furnishing fresh ones, that, however good our new divinity may be, "the old is better." Dr. Sall, the learned writer whose defence of our Church is here re-published, was born in Ireland, but early removed to the University of Valladolid, from which he afterwards migrated to Tudela, and thence to Salamanca. He became rector of the Irish college in the latter city, and was considered one of the most learned divines in Spain, and one of the most able members of the Jesuit Society. The steps by which he was gradually led to forsake Popery are admirably narrated by himself in this work, as well as the persecutions which he suffered in consequence of this resolution. His opponents in controversy were men well skilled and well read; and it may be affirmed, that he who wishes to ascertain the nature and grounds of the dispute between the Church of England and that of Rome will find them fully and clearly set forth in this one volume. Mr. Allport has our thanks for reprinting so valuable a book, and for the notes with which he has enriched it—notes displaying at once sound learning and sound judgment. We can cordially recommend the work to our readers.

A Practical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Church Catechism; chiefly compiled from the Writings of the most approved Divines. By a MEMBER of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Burns. 1840.

THIS is a truly admirable compilation; sound, clear, and eminently practical; by far the best commentary on the Catechism extant; and well adapted for the diocesan training schools. We must, however, correct a rather absurd error (not in divinity) into which the writer has fallen: *surname*, not *strname*, is derived from *sur-nomme*, super-nomen, and not from *sire-name*, or father's name.

Gospel Extracts for Young Children. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

IF any mother thinks it more advisable to teach her children out of a small octavo book, with a blue cloth cover, with a part of the Gospel in the inside, than from a duodecimo book with a brown calf cover, and the whole of the Gospels, together with the rest of the New Testament, contained therein—here is the book prepared to her hands. This is all we can say for this specimen of the modern art of book-making.

An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England, from the first planting of Christianity to the end of the Reign of King Charles the Second; with a Brief Account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland; Collected from the best Ancient Historians, Councils, and Records. By JEREMY COLLIER, M.A. New Edition; with a Life of the Author, the Controversial Tracts connected with the History, Notes, and an Enlarged Index. By FRANCIS BARHAM, Esq. Vols. I. II. III. IV. London: Straker. 1840.

THIS important work is now reprinted, with the additions above stated; and we are hardly aware of a greater service that can be done to the community than that which Mr. Barham has performed. The facility of publication, which so deluges us with trash, does also furnish us with the sterling productions of other ages: productions which have stood the test of criticism and of time. We do not intend to say more at present on Mr. Straker's welcome publication, as we purpose before long to recur to it at considerable length. We now give, as a specimen of the notes, a passage which will set in a clear light Mr. Barham's high qualifications as an editor:—

“By degrees the syncretic doctrine of kingship prevailed, and was fully established in the reign of Henry VIII. After that period the true dignity and supremacy of the crown were secured. Some writers were indeed still found absurd enough to represent the king as so ecclesiastical a person, that he had no business to interfere in secular matters, as if, like another Edward the Confessor, he had become “*civiler mortuus*,” and some others, going to the opposite extreme, represented him as so civil and secular, that he had no authority to sway ecclesiastical affairs. But the opinions of these writers, though they made some stir, and exhibited very violent oscillations, never again regained the ascendancy. I am obliged thus early to be very explicit on this particular question, which is so vehemently and elaborately discussed by Collier. The more the parental character of the British crown is understood, the more certainly will our national monarch become a centre and bond of union to all ecclesiastical and political denominations within this empire. Beneath a sovereignty thus emulative of the God from whom it sprung, and whose government it exemplifies to men, will Jews, Papalists and Protestants maintain their several spheres of action in harmony and prosperity. If our national monarchy is to be held any thing short of this, our sects and parties become as children without a parent, each running riot in a vain assumption of superiority, ‘an anarchy of spirits toy-bewitch’d.’”—Vol. ii. p. 179.

While however Mr. Barham thus upholds the rights of monarchy over all parties, and supports civil and religious liberty, he not the less strongly upholds the rights—the indefeasible rights—of the Catholic Church.

A Treatise on Justification. By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDEN, M.A.
12mo. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

IN our exposure of the papistical tendency of the so-called "Tracts for the Times," we introduced the name of Mr. Holden to our readers as the author of a perspicuous and valuable "Treatise on Tradition," of whose reasonings we gave an abstract. (See vol v. of our Journal, pp. 209, &c., &c.) The same calmness of mind, sobriety of thought, and close argumentation, which characterized that work, will be found to pervade his "Treatise on Justification." As the primitive Church taught the doctrine of justification by faith generally, without attempting any particular delineation of it, Mr. H. considers it as being quite in vain to have recourse to its authority for deciding the many questions to which it has given rise in *modern* times. His discussion, therefore, is drawn exclusively from the divinely inspired Scriptures. The following is the order which he has adopted in prosecuting his inquiry. After some preliminary remarks, in chapter ii. he treats on the nature of justification. This, he proves, is an act of God, which includes an acquittal from the guilt of sin, a reception into the divine favour, a communication of the Holy Spirit, a grant of righteousness, and a right and title to eternal life. He then considers the objection that this view confounds justification with sanctification; and in chapter iii. he exhibits the means, or instrument, or condition of justification, viz., faith; the nature, distinctive character, object, cause and effects of which are investigated. The connexion of works with justification, and the doctrine of merit are next examined; and the supposed discrepancy between the apostles Paul and James is reconciled. Chapter iv. treats on the time of justification; and the necessity of the Holy Spirit's influence throughout is strongly urged. In conclusion, the doctrine of the Romish Church concerning justification is developed and exposed. As Mr. Holden has himself briefly but accurately summed up his discussion, we think we cannot do better than present his own abstract of it to our readers:—

"Justification, then, 'is an act of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' by which, from mere grace and mercy, through the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, he acquits men from the guilt of sin, receives them into favour, communicates to them the Holy Spirit, regards them as righteous, and bestows a right and title to eternal life. The required condition, on the part of men, is a *fruitful faith*; and by this faith justification, through divine grace, commences at baptism, is preserved during life, and receives its consummation in future glory."—p. 116.

In an appendix Mr. Holden has given a bibliographical list of the principal Treatises on Justification. No reader who sits

down to the *candid* perusal of this volume can lay it aside without feeling sentiments of great respect for the devout, temperate, and lucid manner in which he has conducted this very important discussion.

-
1. *Guy Fawkes ; or, the Gunpowder Treason, A.D. 1605 ; with a Developement of the Principles of the Conspirators, and an Appendix on the Authorship of the Anonymous Letter.* By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. Second edition, corrected and enlarged. 12mo. London: J. W. Parker. 1840.
 2. *The Spanish Armada, A.D. 1588 ; or, the Attempt of Philip II. and Pope Pius VI. to re-establish Popery in England.* By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. 12mo. London: J. W. Parker.

THE first edition of Mr. Lathbury's "Guy Fawkes" was published in 1839, and was reviewed at considerable length in our number for January, 1840 ; in which we instituted a judicial examination of the evidences demonstrating the guilt of the Papists convicted of, or implicated in, the atrocious Gunpowder Treason, and we directed Mr. L.'s attention to some additional sources of information, of which we rejoice to see that he has diligently availed himself. The proceedings of the conspirators are now traced with chronological minuteness ; so as to enable the reader to perceive how they advanced month by month. There is also a curious account of the concealment and discovery of the traitors, Robert Winter and Stephen Lyttleton. Much new and interesting matter is added respecting the guilty Jesuit, Garnet. In an appendix Mr. L. has gone fully into an examination of the authorship of the celebrated letter addressed to Lord Monteagle, of which he has given a lithographed facsimile, and also of the pretended miraculous straw representing the features of Garnet, and of the signature of Guy Fawkes. These additions impart much interest as well as a permanent value to Mr. Lathbury's History of the Gunpowder Treason ; which, in its present greatly improved state, is not only a valuable present for the young, but is deserving of a place in every well-chosen library.

The same character is applicable to his History of "the Spanish Armada ;" all the circumstances of which and the machinations of the Papists are fully developed. References to authentic sources of information are given throughout ; and the erroneous statements and misrepresentations of the popish historian, Dr. Lingard, are detected and censured in terms of severity, which however are not more strong than they are richly deserved.

Oriental Musings; and other Poems. By P. SCOTT, Esq. London: Fraser. 1840.

WHEN a few months back we spoke, with great pleasure, of the "Hope of the World," by Mr. Mackay, as a poem full of bright promise, and no mean performance, we said somewhat of the paucity of poets. The volume now before us is one of a rather anomalous character. There are parts, especially the translations from the Persian, so good as to give us a very high opinion of the writer; and other parts so poor as to appear by an ill educated school-boy. Mr. Scott is evidently capable of good things; none but a poet could have written what follows:—

"Alas, how dark and silent now
Is what was once so brightly fair!
Over the cold and marble brow,
The tangles of her raven hair,
Wet with the dews of death, are straying;
While, like unto a stringless lute,
That hath forgot its former playing,
The music of her lips is mute!"

Many such exquisite passages are to be found; and we will not spoil the effect of what we have quoted, by bringing forward any of the poor frigid conceits that may be seen in other parts of the volume.

Proper Lessons to be read at Morning and Evening Prayer on the Sundays and other Holidays throughout the Year; with a short Practical Commentary and Explanatory Notes. By JOHN JAMES, D.D., Prebendary of Peterborough. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

OF this book we must speak very neutrally. It is neatly printed; but why it was printed at all we cannot very easily comprehend. The Notes are free from objectionable matter, but they are extremely slight. The New Testament, which is added to the Morning Lessons, has scarcely any elucidations; and while we entertain no doubt that Dr. James had some good reason for preparing the book and dedicating it to his Royal Highness Prince Albert, we confess that we can see no reason either for one or the other.

Letters from Italy, to a Younger Sister. By CATHERINE TAYLOR. London: Murray. 1840.

A DELIGHTFUL work, from which, did our limits permit, we would willingly make long extracts; and we hope to return to it on another opportunity. Miss Taylor promises a second volume. We trust that she will perform this promise; and if the book be as interesting, as eloquent, and as instructive as the present, all younger sisters will have cause to thank her.

Heber ; Records of the Poor ; Lays from the Prophets ; and other Poems. By THOMAS RAGG, Author of "The Incarnation," "The Deity," &c., &c. London: Longmans. 1840.

MR. Ragg has raised himself from the situation of a labourer to that of Editor of a Conservative newspaper: this he has done simply by the energy of his mental character, while among the poets of our day he holds already a distinguished place. The present volume is well calculated to add to his reputation. Always religious, and often sublime, his works are fit for the young as well as the old, and calculated to foster a spirit of true piety, and a love of order and subordination.

An Outline of the History of the British Church. By PHILECCLESIA. London: Burns. 1840.

IN ninety-four pages we have here an abridgment of Mr. Churton's "Early English Church," and a notice of her history to the time of the Reformation. So short, yet so judicious a manual, should be learned by heart; this is its true use. Churton is the book to read; Collier to consult. This little book should be in all Sunday Schools, and lending libraries; it is well adapted as a present to children of from twelve to fifteen years of age, and forms a very good introduction to the reading of Churton.

The History of England in Amusing Conversations between a Mother and her Children, during their residence at Shanklin, in the Isle of Wight. By ANNE WOOLTON. London: Painter. 1840.

THOSE who are doubtful as to the tendency of a History, need have no fear in putting this into the hands of their children: it is both sound and "amusing," gives a just account of events, and takes a correct view of political questions, without however being what is called a political book.

SERMONS.

1. *Six Sermons on the Church and her Ministry.* By the Rev. JOHN STONARD, D.D., Rector of Aldingham. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
2. *God's History of Man: Sermons preached in Eaton Chapel.* By the Rev. JOHN EDWARD SABIN, B.A., Minister of the Chapel, and Rector of Preston Bissett, Bucks. London: Hatchards. 1840.
3. *Olney Lectures.* By the Rev. D. B. LANGLEY, D. C. L., late of St. John's College, Cambridge, Vicar of Olney. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1840.
4. *Ministerial First Fruits; or, Twenty Practical Sermons, both on General and Particular Subjects.* By the Rev. J. W. WATSON, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Vicar of Ellerburne. London: Hatchards. 1840.

5. *Sermons*. By the late Rev. THOMAS WEBSTER, B. D., Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge. London: Seeleys. 1840
6. *Sermons on Various Subjects*. By the Rev. H. W. B. DAUBENY, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Matthew, Cainscross. Dedicated to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. London: Burns. 1840.
7. *Sermons on Miscellaneous Subjects; with Notes and an Appendix*. By WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and Minister of Portman Chapel, St. Marylebone. Vol. II. London: Cleaver. 1840.
8. *Justification through Faith. The merciful Character of the Gospel Covenant. The Sufficiency of Scripture as a Rule of Faith. Three Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the course of the past and present year*. By PHILIP N. SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Fosley, Wilts. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
9. *Plain Parochial Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Bolton-le-Moors*. By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A., Vicar of Bolton, and Prebendary of Chester. Vol. IV. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

IF we are to look at the volumes of Sermons from week to week published as specimens, fair specimens, of our parochial pulpits (and we believe we may safely do this), then we must congratulate ourselves, the Church at large, and the cause of religion in general, on the progressive improvement—instead of mere declamation, we have solid argument—instead of froth and enthusiasm, we have cool, rational, yet devout, evangelical high-churchmanship; and we may refer to the Sermons by Mr. Webster and Mr. Watson as admirable instances. The authority and commission of the Church, the dangers of delusion and the means of avoiding it, are set forth in strong, yet affectionate language; and we rejoice to be able to extend the same praise to Dr. Stonard.

The Discourses of Dr. Langley are purely practical; and even had they less merit than they have, we should be inclined to speak highly of them on account of the institution on behalf of which they were preached. A Training School for servants is an institution which is much wanted, and calculated to do the most extensive good.

We pass to the Sermons of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Sabin, which are of a highly original character. Their style (not their doctrines) is peculiarly that of modern Oxford; but they exhibit great research and large power of mind. Mr. Bennett is the more original—Mr. Sabin the more practical of the two.

Mr. Daubeny's Sermons, though sanctioned by a permitted dedication to the Archbishop of Canterbury, are of a more common-place character; they are however very good, and prove that the villagers of Cainscross have a pastor both able and faithful.

We now pass on to the three discourses of Dr. Shuttleworth, the newly appointed Bishop of Chichester; and excellent as they are in themselves—honourable both to the eloquent prelate and to the University before which they were delivered—they are doubly valuable at the present moment. Satisfied, however, with the promulgation of evangelical truth, his lordship says but little in any of his works in favour of apostolical order, and hence has originated an idea, extensively prevalent, that the Bishop of Chichester entertains very “liberal” views on Church government and Church authority. We have good reason to know that this notion is an incorrect one; but one word from the right reverend prelate on this subject would be more satisfactory than fifty from us, and we hope that he will soon speak it.

Of Mr. Slade much need not be said; he is too well known and too universally respected to take up the pen in vain, and right glad are we to see a fourth volume of his admirable parochial sermons. There is here the same practical tone, the same fervour—rational fervour of devotion, the same clear views of divine truth, the same sound advocacy of Church principles, that made Mr. Slade’s three former volumes so valuable.

We will not dismiss these volumes of Sermons without again adverting to Mr. Sabin and Mr. Watson; the former has given us not merely Sermons, but a connected work, one too which is qualified to set many thinking on not a few important topics. The style is good as well as the matter, and we shall be ever pleased to meet Mr. Sabin again in the same walks of sacred literature. Mr. Watson is a young writer and a young preacher, but the promise is more than fair, and we should be sorry to speak of discourses so good as these as being creditable to a young man—they would be creditable to any preacher.

Surely with an increase, a continued increase of men like these whose published addresses are before us, we may hope for a proportionate increase in the efficiency and acceptability of the Church; we may hope that God, who is thus pouring out his Spirit upon his ministers, will also pour out of the same Spirit upon their flocks. “So that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive the engrafted word which is able to save their souls.”

PAMPHLETS.

1. *The Affairs of this World all Ordered with a Reference to the Church: a Sermon, &c.* By THOMAS STONE, M.A. London: Burns.
2. *The Mercy of God a Call to Repentance: a Sermon, &c.* By the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. London: Burns. 1840.

3. *A Sermon on the Preservation of our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, &c.* By the Rev. J. G. EBDEN, M.A. Ipswich: Pawsey.
4. *The Worship of Imaginations: a Sermon.* By BISHOP ANDREWS. Edited by the Rev. H. H. Victor, B.A. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
5. *The Claim of the S. P. G. F. P. upon all Members of the Church: a Sermon.* By the Right Rev. JOHN INGLIS, D.D., Bishop of Nova Scotia. London: Wix. 1840.
6. *A Series of Documents and Authorities on the Duty, Advantage, and Necessity of Public Catechising in the Church.* Collected by the Rev. JOHN LEY, M.A. London: Burns. 1840.
7. *A Letter to the Clergy on the Speech of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Norwich in the House of Lords, May 26, 1840.* By a PRIEST OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
8. *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Primitive Church on the Subject of Religious Celibacy; with a Vindication of the Early Church from the mistakes of the Author of "Ancient Christianity." Part II.* By JAMES BEAVEN, M.A. Curate of Leigh. London: Rivingtons.
9. *On Intercourse between the Church of England and the Churches in the East, and on the Ecclesiastical Condition of the English abroad.* By JAMES BEAVEN, M.A. Curate of Leigh. London: Rivingtons.
10. *"If any provide not for his own:." A Sermon preached in All Souls Church, St. Mary-le-bone.* By W. I. E. BENNETT, M.A. Minister of Portman Chapel. London: Cleaver. 1840.
11. *Observations on a Petition for the Revision of the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, with a Report of the Discussion it caused in the House of Lords, May 26, 1840.* By JOHN HULL, M.A. Vicar of Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire; and WILLIAM WINSTANLEY HULL, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, late Fellow of Brazen-nose College, Oxford. London: Seeley. 1840.
12. *An Enquiry respecting the Destiny of the Ten Tribes.* By a LAYMAN. London: Rivingtons. 1840.
13. *A Speech delivered at the Official Dinner of High Sheriff Tomlinson, in the city of Dublin.* By ISAAC BUTT Esq., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Dublin. London: Fraser. 1840.
14. *Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill: a Speech on Behalf of Deans and Chapters, made before the Long Parliament in 1641.* By JOHN HACKETT, D.D. Can. Res. of St. Paul's, and afterwards Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. Now reprinted, with Preface and Notes, by a Clegyman. London: Painter. 1840.
15. *The Case of St. Paul, and the Necessity of Appointment to the Ministerial Office: a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Witney.* By the Rev. THOMAS FARLEY, B.D. Oxon. London: Burns.
16. *Courvoisier: a Sermon preached at Eton Chapel, London, on Sunday July 12, 1840.* By the Rev. JOHN EDWARD SABIN, B.A., Minister of the Chapel, and Rector of Preston Bisset, Bucks. London: Hatchards. 1840.
17. *Religion and Crime; or, the Distresses of the People and their Remedies.* By JOHN MINTER MORGAN. London: Longmans. 1840.

18. *A Discourse on Protestantism.* By the REV. CHARLES BURTON, LL.D. F.L.S. &c. London: Seeley. 1840.
19. *An Appeal on Behalf of Church Government, &c.* By a MEMBER OF THE CHURCH. London: Houlston and Stoneman. 1840.
20. *The Watchman's Cry: a Sermon* preached before the Members of the Grand Protestant Confederation. By the REV. C. BURTON, LL.D. F.L.S., Minister of All Saints Church, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester. Manchester: Pratt. 1840.
21. *A Sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, Bagnor, in aid of the Funds of the Sussex, East Hampshire, and Chichester Infirmary.* By the REV. EDWARD MILLER, M.A., Perpetual Curate. Chichester: Mason. 1840.
22. *The Clergy Watchmen unto the People: a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Melton Mowbray, at the Primary Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Peterborough.* By the REV. HENRY ALFORD, M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

WE have here two-and-twenty pamphlets. Of the 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 22, it will be sufficient to say that they are good Sermons; though we like not the taste displayed in the choice of a subject by Mr. Sabin; and we observe with pleasure the large and increasing sale of Dr. Burton's admirable Sermons. No. 4 is a timely reprint of an excellent Discourse by Bishop Andrews; and No. 14 an equally timely reprint of Bishop Hacket's speech on Cathedral Establishments. Alas! that it was not able to preserve them from spoliation. The remarkable observations of the Bishop of Norwich on the twenty-sixth of May last, in the House of Lords, have called forth a severe but just letter (No. 7) from a "Priest of the Church of England;" and an attempt, a vain attempt, to justify his Lordship, by the writers of the "Observations" (No. 11). No. 19 is a pamphlet at once uncalled for, ill-conceived, and ill-written. No. 13 is a tract deserving of attention, though the subject is hardly likely to interest the reader on this side St. George's Channel. No 14 is also worthy of attention; and so are those most important "Documents and Authorities" brought forward by Mr. Ley (No. 6). Nos. 8 and 9 are tracts by Mr. Beaven—tracts whose titles will explain their objects, and most successful is the learned author in both the one and the other: we shall probably return to these works again. In conclusion, we must say a few words of commendation about Mr. Morgan's pamphlet, which is accompanied by a very well executed plate. Mr. Morgan, rightly attributing the crimes and distresses of the poor to a want of religious instruction, proposes a Christian Socialism; and his remarks certainly deserve a careful investigation.



